Evolution of Rabbinic Discourse on the Creation of Woman in Late Antiquity

Katja von Schöneman
Master's Thesis
Old Testament Exegetics
Master's Program in Theology and Religious Studies
Faculty of Theology
University of Helsinki
September 2019

HELSINGIN YLIOPISTO − HELSINGFORS UNIVERSITET

Tiedekunta − Fakultet
Teologinen tiedekunta

Koulutusohjelma − Utbildningsprogram
Teologian ja uskonnontutkimuksen maisteriohjelma

Tekijä − Författare
Katja von Schöneman

Työn nimi − Arbetets titel
Evolution of Rabbinic Discourse on the Creation of Woman in Late Antiquity

Työn laji − Arbetets art
Pro gradu -tutkielma

Aika − Datum
Syyskuu 2019

Sivumäärä − Sidoantal
108 + 5

Tiivistelmä

Uskonnollisen tulkintaperinteen kehitystä luonnehtii perimätiedon muuntuminen välitysprosessin myötä. Myöhemmät huomiot rakentuvat aina aiemman perinteen varaan niin, että joitain yksityiskohtia unohtuu siinä, missä osa tiedosta muuttuu – lisäksi traditioihin voidaan lisätä uutta ainesta. Tällainen prosessi voidaan juutalaisessa tulkintaperinteessä nähdä erityisesti rabbiinisessa kirjallisuudessa, eikä rabbiininen diskurssi naisen luomiseen liittyen poikkeakaan tästä perusolettamuksesta. Myös naisen luomisena pidettyä Raamatun tekstijaksoa on tulkittu historian saatossa kontekstisidonnaisista ja alati muuttuvista lähtökohdista käsin, mikä on osaltaan vahvistanut sukupuolten välistä epäsymmetriaa ylläpitäviä raamatuntulkintoja. Koska nainen on nähty miehelle alisteisena tämän kylkiluusta riippuvaisen luomisensa vuoksi, on tilanne vaikuttanut monella tapaa myös naisten oikeudelliseen asemaan.

Tässä tutkimuksessa arvioidaan naisen luomiseen liittyvien rabbiinisten tulkintojen historiallista kehitystä myöhäisantiikissa. Tutkimuksen aikaikkuna on 400-luvulta 800-luvulle niin, että se keskittyy rabbien laatiman tutkintakirjallisuuden tuotteliampaan aikaan. Koska tutkimuksen keskiössä on rabbiinisten tekstien sukupuolisensitiivinen tarkastelu ja erityisesti naisvihamielisten asenteiden kertymisen jäljittäminen, sen teoreettista viitekehystä kuvaa parhaiten feministinen kriittinen diskurssianalyysi. Myöhäisantiikin tekstejä analysoidaan kiinnittäen huomiota niiden kaikenkattavaan patriarkaaliseen sävyyn sekä sisällöllisten että kielellisten yksityiskohtien valossa.

Rabbiinisen diskurssin kehityskulku voidaan työssä tarkastellun aineiston valossa jakaa kolmeen perättäiseen diskursiiviseen vaiheeseen. Ensimmäisen vaiheen kirjallisen materiaalin muodostavat kaksi tunnettua, varhaista raamatuntulkintaa edustavaa 400-luvulla koottua teosta, Genesis Rabba ja Leviticus Rabba, jotka rakensivat perustan rabbiinisille tulkinnoille naisen luomisesta. Vaikka rabbit ponnistelivatkin kahden erilaisen luomiskertomuksen yhteensovittamiseksi, sukupuolten luominen nähdään aineistossa kahdeksi perättäiseksi tapahtumaksi. Naisten arveluttavat luonteenpiirteet sekä sisäsyntyinen heikkous liitetään jo Eevan luomiseen. Koska naisen rooli on ensisijaisesti kodinhengettärenä ja koristeena oleminen, miehen tulee alistaa vaimonsa ja pitää hänet sisätiloissa.

Rabbiinisen kirjallisuuden seuraavaa, 500-luvulle ajoittuvaa diskursiivista vaihetta analysoitiin tutkimuksessa lukuisten babylonialaisesta Talmudista valittujen, aiempaa tulkintaperinnettä vahvistavien katkelmien valossa. Raamatussa kuvattua, kenties Aadamin hännästä tai kasvoista tapahtunutta Eevan luomista käsittelevää tekstijaksoa käytetään niissä selittämään naisen ruumiinrakennetta, joka soveltuu erinomaisesti raskaana olemiseen. Eevaa tarvitaan palvelijattareksi, mutta naisia arvostetaan myös heidän viihdyttävyytensä vuoksi. Vaimon omistaminen rinnastetaan tässä diskursiivisessa vaiheessa maanomistukseen.

Kolmatta diskursiivista vaihetta, jossa aiempaa tulkintaperinnettä alettiin laajentaa, tutkittiin neljän erilaisen 600–800-luvuille sijoittuvan rabbiinisen tekstin – Targum Pseudo-Jonathanin, Avot de-Rabbi Nathanin, Pirkei de-Rabbi Eliezerin ja Alphabet of Ben Siran – kautta. Näissä kirjoitelmissa esiintyvien lisäysten perusteella Eeva luotiin Aadamin kolmannestatoista kylkiluusta ja tämän sydämessä sijainneesta lihasta. Luomiskertomusta aletaan käyttää seksuaalisen riiston perusteluna, ja nainen kuvataan pahansisuisena sekä aikaisin vanhenevana ”toisena”. Tästäkin huolimatta Aadamilla itsellään oli kaksi vaimoa, joista ensimmäinen, Lilit, tarjoaa omaperäisen ratkaisun kahden erilaisen luomiskertomuksen yhteensovittamiseen liittyvään eksegeettiseen ongelmaan. Lisäksi Lilitin tarina opettaa naisille, että tasa-arvon vaatiminen voi johtaa vakaviin seuraamuksiin: Lilit itse muuttui sen seurauksena riivaajaksi, joka menettää sata omaa lastaan päivittäin.

Avainsanat – Nyckelord
juutalaisuus, Raamattu, eksegetiikka, rabbiininen kirjallisuus, luominen, juutalainen feminismi, feministinen kriittinen diskurssianalyysi, Talmud, Genesis Rabbah, Aadam, Eeva

Säilytyspaikka – Förvaringställe
Keskustakampuksen kirjasto

UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

Faculty
Faculty of Theology

Program
Master's Program in Theology and Religious Studies

Author
Katja von Schöneman

Title
Evolution of Rabbinic Discourse on the Creation of Woman in Late Antiquity

Level
Master's Thesis

Month and year
September 2019

Number of pages
108 + 5

Abstract

The formation and development of religious interpretive tradition can be characterized as transformation through transmission. Later annotations are always built upon earlier accounts and some details are lost whereas others may be altered – in addition, material can also be added. In Jewish interpretive tradition, this can particularly be seen within rabbinic literature, and rabbinic discourse on the creation of woman does not deviate from this fundamental assumption. The biblical passages discussing human creation have been interpreted accordingly, with context-dependent and ever-changing premises, enabling explications conniving asymmetry of genders and potentially affecting the legal status of woman who has often been seen as subordinate to man based on her derivative creation from man's rib.

The present study was designed to examine the diachronic development of rabbinic interpretations on the creation of woman. The timeframe of the study is from the 5th to the 9th century, concentrating on the era of most voluminous rabbinic activity. The theoretical framework of the study can be best described as feminist critical discourse analysis as the focus of the analyses is on gender-sensitive reading of the rabbinic texts, specifically addressing the accumulation of misogynous elements along the trajectory. The texts are analyzed paying attention to the all-encompassing patriarchal ethos, taking into account both contentual and linguistic features.

Based on the material analyzed in the study, the evolution of rabbinic discourse concerning the creation of woman took place in three consecutive discursive stages. The writings of the first one of them (5th century) comprises Genesis Rabba and Leviticus Rabba, well-known pieces of early exegesis to the Hebrew Bible, establishing the corpus of rabbinic traditions as the basis of rabbinic interpretations on the creation of woman. In spite of the rabbis' efforts to harmonize the two different biblical creation narratives, the creation of genders is understood as two consecutive events. Dubious characteristics and indigenous feebleness of women are, among others, related to the creation of Eve. Furthermore, man has to subjugate his wife and confine her indoors, as her role is mainly domestic and ornamental.

The next discursive stage of rabbinic writings (6th century) was examined through an ample set of traditions collected into the gigantic compilation of Babylonian Talmud, reinforcing the previous traditions. Linguistic features of the biblical account on Eve's creation – perhaps from a face or a tail of Adam – are used to explain her basic shape, ideal for bearing a child. Eve is needed to serve as a handmaid, but women are also acknowledged for their entertaining potential. Owning a wife is parallelized with possessing land.

The third discursive stage, examined through four different kinds of rabbinic writings – Targum Pseudo-Jonathan, Avot de-Rabbi Nathan, Pirkei de-Rabbi Eliezer, and Alphabet of Ben Sira – compiled during the 7th–9th centuries, is characterized as expanding the earlier interpretive tradition. According to these augmentations, Eve was made out of Adam's thirteenth rib and flesh from his heart. The creation narrative is used to attest sexual exploitation of women, interpreted as bad-tempered and fast-aging, among other frailties. Adam, however, had two wives – and his first wife, Lilith, offers a distinctive solution to the classical exegetic problem caused by the two different biblical accounts on human creation. Furthermore, her story teaches women that demanding equality can have serious consequences as she, herself, became a devil who loses a hundred of her own children on a daily basis.

Keywords
Judaism, Bible, exegesis, rabbinic literature, creation, Jewish feminism, feminist critical discourse analysis, Talmud, Genesis Rabbah, Adam, Eve

Where deposited
City Center Campus Library

~

ברוך אתה ה' אלהינו מלך העולם

עושה מעשה בראשית

~

Table of Contents

Technical Notes 1
Transcription of Hebrew & Aramaic 2
Abbreviations 3

1. Introduction – Creation of Woman and Jewish Interpretive Tradition 4
1.1. Creation of Human and Emergence of Woman in Hebrew Bible 4
1.2. Creation of Woman in Jewish Interpretive Tradition 6
1.3. Rabbinic Literature as Textual Reception of Tora 8

2. Material & Methods – Feminist Critical Discourse Analysis of Rabbinic Discourse 11
2.1. Aim of the Study 11
2.2. Selection and Description of Rabbinic Material 11
2.3. Theoretical Framework 13

3. Literature Review – Approaches to Rabbinic Concept of Female Creation 21
3.1. Short Excursion into Feminist Approaches in Rabbinic Studies 21
3.2. Creation of Woman in Rabbinic Literature 24
3.3. Rabbinic Conceptions of Human Creation 29
3.4. *Ḥawwâ* in Rabbinic Tradition 31

4. Establishing Tannaitic Corpus of *Aggādâ* – *Midrāš Rabbāʾ* 32
4.1. *Bərēʾšît Rabbāʾ* – Genesis Rabba 33
4.2. *Way-yiqrāʾ Rabbāʾ* – Leviticus Rabba 47

5. Amoraic Reinforcement of the Interpretive Tradition – *Talmûd Bāvlî* 50
5.1. *Sēder Zərāʿîm* – Agricultural Laws 52
5.2. *Sēder Môʿēd* – Holy Occasions & Festivals 55
5.3. *Sēder Nāšîm* – Women & Marriage Law 58
5.4. *Sēder Nəzîqîn* – Damages & Civil Law 61
5.5. *Sēder Ṭāhŏrôt* – Purification Rituals 64

6. Geonic Augmentations to Rabbinic Interpretations 66
6.1. *Targûm Yerûšalmî* – Targum Pseudo-Jonathan 67
6.2. *Āvôt də-Rabbî Nātān* – Fathers According to Rabbi Nathan 69
6.3. *Pirqêy də-Rabbî Ĕlîʿezer* – Chapters of Rabbi Eliezer 74
6.4. *Ālefbêt də-Bēn Sîrāʾ* – Alphabet of Ben Sira 77

7. Conclusions – Evolution of Rabbinic Discourse on Creation of Woman 81

Bibliography 86
Primary Sources 86
Translations 86
Devices 87
Research Literature 88

Appendix I – Creation of Human in Hebrew Bible 101
Appendix II – List of Rabbis 102
Appendix III – Glossary of Terminology and Texts 104

Technical notes

As the present study addresses namely *Jewish* interpretive tradition, all biblical quotations throughout the study follow the new English translation of the Masoretic (Hebrew) Bible published in 1985 by the Jewish Publication Society. Hebrew and Aramaic script is avoided to keep the text easy to read. However, the biblical passages concerning the creation of human, particularly that of woman, are also given in their Hebrew form in Appendix I.

There are a lot of direct Hebrew and Aramaic quotations which are written in precise transcription according to the chart below. Vowels are marked only when they are known based either on *matres lectionis*, vocalized texts found at Sefaria.org, or dictionaries. It is worth noting that especially the vocalization follows conventions made long after the compilation of the texts analyzed in the present study. In the case of Aramaic, in particular, the transcription as a whole is an approximation. However, as the emphasis of the study is in the quiddity of the rabbinic accounts and not in detailed linguistic features, this seems admissible. The content of the citations from the original texts is given in English throughout the study.

For proper names, exact transcription is avoided and a modified style, mainly based on *Encyclopaedia Judaica* (2nd edition) and research literature, is used for clarity. This applies specifically to the rabbis' names, listed in Appendix II. Similar modifications were also made in connection with the names of the Jewish scriptures (except for their subunits) which are first given in their fully transcribed forms but later referred to using their academically known versions. Some Hebrew- and Aramaic-derived terms are used in their transcribed forms due to the lack of comprehensive translations for the given terms – this terminology, as well as the names of the texts analyzed, are listed in Appendix III. If adjectives are derived from such terms, however, they are adjusted into an English format (*e.g.*, *āmôrāʾîm* → "amoraic").

The terms *rabbi* (Hebrew) and *rav* (Aramaic), the meaning being identical, are used as they appear in the primary source in question. The frequently used attribution of God, "The Holy One, blessed be he", is omitted from the citations for clarity. The names of the primal couple, *Ādām* and *Ḥawwâ*, are mainly used in their English forms, Adam and Eve, unless being a fixed part of a quotation. In order to keep the timeframe explicit, all calendar events (years) are given according to the Gregorian solar calendar instead of the Jewish one.

Transcription of Hebrew and Aramaic

Consonants		
א	*ʾālef*	ʾ
ב	*bêt*	*b – v*
ג	*gîmel*	*g*
ד	*dālet*	*d*
ה	*hê*	*h*
ו	*wāw*	*w*
ז	*zayin*	*z*
ח	*ḥêt*	*ḥ*
ט	*ṭêt*	*ṭ*
י	*yôd*	*y*
כ ך	*kāf*	*k – ḵ*
ל	*lāmed*	*l*
מ ם	*mêm*	*m*
נ ן	*nûn*	*n*
ס	*sāmeḵ*	*s*
ע	*ʿayin*	ʿ
פ ף	*pê*	*p – f*
צ ץ	*ṣādê*	*ṣ*
ק	*qôf*	*q*
ר	*rêš*	*r*
שׂ	*śîn*	*ś*
שׁ	*šîn*	*š*
ת	*tāw*	*t*

Vowels		
בַ	*pataḥ*	*a*
בַ*	furtive *pataḥ*	*ʾa*
בָ	*qāmeṣ*	*ā*
בָה	final *qāmeṣ hê*	*â*
בָיו	3rd masc. sg. suf.	*āyw*
בֶ	*sĕgōl*	*e*
בֵ	*ṣērê*	*ē*
בֶי	*ṣērê yôd*	*ê* (בֶי= *êy*)
בֶי	*sĕgōl yôd*	*ê* (בֶי= *êy*)
בִ	short *ḥîreq*	*i*
בִ	long *ḥîreq*	*ī*
בִי	*ḥîreq yôd*	*î*
בָ	*qāmeṣ ḥāṭûf*	*o*
בֹ	*ḥōlem*	*ō*
וֹ	full *ḥōlem*	*ô*
בֻ	short *qibbûṣ*	*u*
בֻ	long *qibbûṣ*	*ū*
וּ	*šûreq*	*û*
בֳ	*ḥāṭēf qāmeṣ*	*ŏ*
בֲ	*ḥāṭēf pataḥ*	*ă*
בֱ	*ḥāṭēf sĕgōl*	*ĕ*
בְ	vocal *šəwă*	*ə*
* this vocalization is realized only with laryngeals *hê, ḥêt* and *ʿayin* at the end of a word		

The tables present the transcription of Hebrew and Aramaic used in the present study for direct quotations from rabbinic texts as well as words used without translation. It is a slightly modified version of the guidelines presented in *SBL Handbook of Style* (2014) distinguishing, however, the fricative forms of *bêt*, *kāf*, and *pê* according to the table above. Although it might be of interest to make similar distinctions with *gîmel*, *dālet*, and *tāw*, this is avoided in order to make the text as readable as possible for readers only familiar with Modern Hebrew. *Dāgeš forte* in the middle of a word is marked by duplication of the given consonant. If *ʾālef* is the first letter of the word, it is not transcribed.

Abbreviations

b. – someone's son in names, deriving from Hebrew *bēn* or Aramaic *bar*

BCE – before the Common Era

CDA – critical discourse analysis

CE – Common Era

d. – "died", indicating the year of death

det. – definite form (determined state) of Aramaic nouns

Eng. – English (language)

lit. – literally

pl. – plural (grammar)

sg. – singular (grammar)

1. Introduction – Creation of Woman and Jewish Interpretive Tradition

The Hebrew Bible, known as *Tānāḵ* in Jewish tradition, is an important part of the cultural heritage of the ancient Near East.[1] It is the best-known document of the era which probably found its present form some time after the beginning of the Common Era (CE). The Hebrew Bible is also an inseparable part of ancient Near Eastern literature. The traditions collected into it seem to have roots mainly in Mesopotamia, possibly also in Egypt and Syria.[2] It was preserved due to its frequent copying which, however, naturally involves a possibility of textual changes over time.[3] The text has also been recontextualized time and again of which rabbinic literature, introduced below, is a good example.

The first book of the Hebrew Bible is known as *Bərēʾšît*, "in the beginning", named after the first word of the book. In English tradition, it is conventionally referred to as Genesis, deriving from the Latin word for "origin".[4] Until the 18th century, Genesis was generally understood to have been written by Moses. In reality, however, it became formed during a long period of time, and by no means in a literary vacuum – in fact, it shares many linguistic and contential commonalities with other ancient Near Eastern writings.[5] It has ossified into its still-known literary format in the early Jewish community, the features of which it strongly reflects.[6]

Genesis became understood as a part of *Tôrâ* (Tora), referring to the Pentateuch comprising the first five books of the Hebrew Bible,[7] at an early stage of the biblical formation process. According to its themes, it can be divided into two very different kinds of sections: primeval history (Gen. 1–11) and stories of the patriarchs (Gen. 12–36). Primeval history can further be divided into smaller units, one of them being the Garden narrative, frequently addressed in the present study as it also contains the passage understood as the creation of woman.[8]

1.1. Creation of Human and Emergence of Woman in Hebrew Bible

There are two somewhat different kinds of creation narratives in Genesis, Gen. 1:1–2:4a and Gen. 2:4b–25, their differences probably reflecting their distinct origins.[9] In addition, creation

[1] A minor part of the compilation is written in Aramaic (Sarna *et al.* 2007, 582); *Tānāḵ* is an acronym based on the tripartite nature of this composition comprising *Tôrâ* (Instruction), *Nəvîʾîm* (Prophets), and *Kətûvîn* (Hagiographa). In the present study, the Hebrew Bible will also be referred to as the "Scripture".
[2] Most important Sumerian and Akkadian myths beyond biblical mythology concerning human creation are, *e.g., Enki & Ninmaḫ*, *Atra-Ḫasīs* and *Enūma Eliš* (Walton 2006, 204).
[3] Kugel 1998, 1; for canonization process and tripartite nature of the ensemble, see Sarna *et al*. 2007, 574–579.
[4] Sarna 1989, xiii; often referred to as "The First Book of Moses" in Christian tradition.
[5] McKeown 2008, 12; Simkins 1998, 40–44.
[6] Simkins 1998, 32–51.
[7] *I.e.*, Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numeri, and Deuteronomy.
[8] McKeown 2008, 1–4; Speiser 1964, I, LIV.
[9] McKeown 2008, 7.

is addressed in many other biblical passages as well as outside the canon of the Hebrew Bible.[10] The second creation narrative has been suggested to have been born hundreds of years, perhaps even a millennium before the common era,[11] representing the older tradition of the two.[12]

In the first account on human creation (Gen. 1:26–28), God decides to make man, *ādām*, in his image, after his likeness, so that they will rule the animals on earth.[13] When God creates the man, *hā-ādām*, in his image, he creates them male and female.[14] Then he blesses them and encourages them to be fruitful and increase, fill the earth, and master it.[15] These events are repeated later on in Gen. 5:1–2 and Gen. 9:6, retelling that when God created man, *ādām*, he made him in the likeness of God, creating them male and female. And when they were created, God blessed them and called them "Man", *ādām*. God made the man in his image.[16]

Quite early in the second creation narrative (Gen. 2:7) God forms the man, *hā-ādām*, from dust of the earth, *hā-ădāmâ,* and blows the breath of life into his nostrils so that man became a living being.[17] Later on in the same account (Gen. 2:18–24), God realizes that it is not good for the man to be alone, and he decides to make *ʿēzer kə-negdô,* a fitting "helper" for him.[18] First, God forms all kinds of animals out of the earth for the man to name them.[19] As the man gives names to them, no help for Adam is found.[20] So God casts a deep sleep upon the man and takes one of his "ribs", *ṣalʿōtāw*, closing up the flesh at that spot.[21] And he fashioned, *way-*

[10] Clifford 1994, 151–197.
[11] Kvam *et al.* 1999, 26; McKeown 2008, 7.
[12] Noort 2000, 3.
[13] Sefaria.org, Genesis 1:26; the indefinite form of the word *ādām* has been suggested to refer to a generic term "human" or "humankind" by numerous academic and religious scholars.
[14] Sefaria.org, Genesis 1:27; grammatically, *hā-ādām* is a definite form of a masculine singular noun. Due to its definite form, it should most likely be read as a common noun, not as the name Ādām (*e.g.,* Heger 2014, 12). It has frequently been proposed that this phase of the human creation should be read as the creation of a non-gendered primal being (*e.g.,* Meyers 1991, 85; Noort 2000, 11; Simkins 1990, 44–45).
[15] Sefaria.org, Genesis 1:28.
[16] Sefaria.org, Genesis 5:1; Sefaria.org, Genesis 5:2; Sefaria.org, Genesis 9:6.
[17] Sefaria.org, Genesis 2:7; many ancient myths depict the forming of human from different materials, specifically clay (Westermann 1990, 230). It is worth noting that there is a linguistic connection between earth, *ădāmâ*, and human, *ādām*, stylistically typical for ancient creation myths (Walton 2006, 207–209).
[18] Sefaria.org, Genesis 2:18; *ʿēzer kə-negdô* is not a standard Hebrew expression (Teugels 2000, 120) and it has been interpreted in numerous ways in the course of history (Heger 2014, 14; Kvam *et al.* 1999, 28–29; Noort 2000, 12–13). Although the meaning of *ʿēzer*, "help", is quite unequivocal, that of the apposition *kə-negdô*, "opposite or equivalent to him", is not. The matter is detailedly discussed in several subsequent parts of the study. Many scholars have proposed the ultimate meaning of this expression to be mutual connection between equal beings (Meyers 1991, 85; Noort 2000, 12–13, Westermann 1990, 227).
[19] Sefaria.org, Genesis 2:19.
[20] Sefaria.org, Genesis 2:20.
[21] Except for the narrative understood as the creation of woman, the word *ṣelaʿ*, which encompasses a potential synecdochic – a figure of speech in which a part is used for the whole or the whole for a part – meaning of a "rib" here, is translated as "side" almost everywhere else in the Hebrew Bible (LaCocque 2006, 117), the word being most often connected with architecture (Walton 2006, 208). For concordance and the total of 40 other occasions where the Word is used, see https://biblehub.com/hebrew/mitztzalotav_6763.htm; Sefaria.org, Genesis 2:21.

yiven,[22] the rib, taken from the man, into a woman, *iššâ*, and brought her to the man.[23] The man recognizes the woman to be, at last, bone of his bones and flesh of his flesh, and he names her "woman" for she was taken from "man", *îš*.[24] Hence a man leaves his parents and clings to his wife so that they become one flesh.[25] Later, the primal woman is named Ḥawwâ (Eve).

Both creation myths interface with Near Eastern mythology,[26] and even the classic exegetic task of harmonization the two narratives might have had a parallel in Mesopotamian tradition, specifically in connection with the creation of human.[27] The creation of woman is part of the so-called Garden narrative, many details of which can be seen as allusions of other ancient traditions.[28] However, there is no clear parallel account to the creation from a "rib", although it is mentioned as a motif in one Sumerian myth in connection with creation.[29] Nevertheless, an independent description of the creation of woman seems to be unique in ancient mythology.[30]

1.2. Creation of Woman in Jewish Interpretive Tradition

The text of the Hebrew Bible is in fact interpretation as it is. It is a collection of orally transmitted traditions, already interpreted as they passed. When the traditions finally became written down, they were recopied – and reinterpreted – time and again. As nearly all written texts contain potential ambiguities, the need for interpretations, as well as interpreters, becomes evident. This was also the case in postexilic Jewish society.[31] The unvocalized Hebrew writing system provided an additional parameter in the process of interpreting the Scripture.[32] As can be seen from the melange of notes to the previous paragraphs, only addressing some of the most important interpretative challenges, the biblical verses concerning the creation of human and woman are still – after more than two millennia of exegesis – frustratingly nebulous.

---

[22] Lit. "built", providing a basis for affluent rabbinic discussions, as will be seen below. Although the phenomenon is rare in the Hebrew Bible, "building" was a widely used verb for creation in the ancient Near East (Heger 2014, 26; Wenham 1987, 69; Westermann 1990, 230–231).
[23] Sefaria.org, Genesis 2:22; due to the new terminology, *îš* and *iššâ*, this verse has sometimes been read as the birth of distinct genders, male and female (Noort 2000, 11; Westermann 1990, 233).
[24] Sefaria.org, Genesis 2:23.
[25] Sefaria.org, Genesis 2:24; this verse has often been understood as an addition to the original narrative (*e.g.*, Wenham 1987, 70; Westermann 1990, 233).
[26] For comprehensive reviews, see Batto 2013 and Clifford 1994.
[27] Kikawada 1994.
[28] Batto 2013, 55; Noort 2000, 13; Speiser 1964, 19; Wenham 1987, 51–53.
[29] For a closer insight into this, see Kramer 1956, 143–144.
[30] Otzen *et al.* 1980, 45.
[31] Kugel 1998, 1–3, 9–14; "postexilic" refers to the time period from 532 BCE onwards when the Jews exiled in Babylonia were able to return to Palestine.
[32] Kugel 1998, 4.

Already before the closure of the canon of the Hebrew Bible, new textual interpretations of the Scripture were composed.[33] Most of these writings, eventually not ending up in the canon, did not specifically address the creation of woman. However, one of the most important receptions of the Tora, *Book of Jubilees*, made an exception to this. Jubilees, representing biblical interpretation of Antiquity,[34] was composed in Palestine during the 2nd century BCE.[35] Covering Genesis almost entirely, as well as the first part of Exodus,[36] it also retells the creation of woman.[37] Jubilees edits the two biblical creation narratives into a coherent story in which Adam and his wife – the rib – were created during the first week of creation, and the wife was introduced to Adam during the second week of it.[38] The text emphasizes the bony origin of woman which might have had an important role in the later reception of the word *ṣela*ʿ, subsequently understood mainly as a "rib" in the narrative concerning female creation.[39]

Although the primal couple, Adam and Eve, are present in apocrypha and pseudepigrapha, the creation of Eve is not specifically addressed either in them or in the ancient literature found in the caves of the Dead Sea. However, the Jewish exegete and philosopher Philo of Alexandria (d. ~ 50 CE) lengthily discusses the events of creation, also solving the classic exegetical task of harmonizing the two accounts on human creation by his allegorical method. He interprets that the first version of human was an idea of a non-gendered being, whereas the second version encompasses material creation of the human beings.[40] In addition, the Jewish historian Josephus Flavius (d. ~ 100 CE) retells the Garden narrative in his *Jewish Antiquities*, one of the chief representatives of Jewish-Hellenistic literature, composed in Greek.[41] His account on the matter at the focus of this study does not deviate from the Hebrew Bible.[42]

After the destruction of the Second Temple in 70 CE, Judaism was forced to adapt to the new situation. Already during the Herodian rule right before the Common Era, the sages Hillel and Šammai flourished as prominent scholars of biblical exegesis, specifically on matters concerning Jewish law.[43] The disputes between them, and later their disciples, provided a basis

[33] *E.g.*, Crawford 2008.
[34] Kugel 2012, 1.
[35] Crawford 2008, 62.
[36] Crawford 2008, 60–63, 80.
[37] Orpana 2016, 96.
[38] Kugel 2012, 37–38; Orpana 2016, 101.
[39] LaCocque 2006, 117.
[40] Bronner 1994, 39; for a general overview on Philo, see Amir & Niehoff 2007, and for his interpretation on the creation of human, see van den Hoek 2000.
[41] For a general overview on Josephus, see Schalit 2007.
[42] Josephus 1930, 16–19.
[43] Gafni 1984, 10–14.

for subsequent discursive deliberations concerning all kinds of details in the Scripture.[44] This is often thought to have established the trajectory towards the rabbinic movement.[45] After 70 CE, Yavne became the center of Jewish religious scholarship and the *rabbān* Yoḥanan ben Zakkai became a leading figure in rebuilding the religious foundation of the Jewish community.[46] The succeeding development and the interpretative efforts by his disciples marked the transition from pharisaic Judaism into the rabbinic one.[47]

1.3. Rabbinic Literature as Textual Reception of Tora

The over-simplified depiction of the evolution of Jewish interpretive tradition – and the concept of female creation in it – provided above is culminated, from the perspective of the present study, in the textual compilation of orally passed pieces of extrabiblical religious knowledge. They were first collected by five consecutive generations of *tannāʾîm*, "reciters" of traditions, in their formally organized schools and academies (about 20–200 CE).[48] This heritage became understood as the oral part of the law, *Tôrâ še-bəʿal pê*, given to Moses by God at Sinai in addition to the written law, *Tôrâ še-biḵtāv*.[49] The oral Tora became understood as complementary information, and an ever-growing corpus on how to apply the written laws in changing times. The first preserved textual document composed from this basis was *Mišnâ* (Mišna), emerging at the end of the 2nd century.[50] Rabbi Yehuda ha-Nasi, the patriarch of Judea, is considered as the main redactor of this compilation, focusing on apodictic Jewish law formed in the course of history.[51] The mišnaic material is organized into six orders, *sədārîm*,[52] each comprising several *masēḵôt*, tractates.[53]

---

[44] Schwartz 2012, 47–56.
[45] Gafni 1984, 11.
[46] Gafni 1984, 14; *rabbān* is an honorific title given to five Sanhedrin (assembly of Jewish religious and juridical scholars) presidents from the end of the Second Temple period until rabbi Yehuda ha-Nasi, whereas the term *rabbî* became used as a title for the one who has students who have students on their own, indicating a new self-understanding in Judaism after 70 CE (Stemberger 1996, 4). However, it should be noted that the adjective "rabbinic" has a medieval and not a Late-antique genealogy, and the concept of "rabbinic literature" is a product of modern scholarship – furthermore, the teachers forming the collective voice of rabbinic writings are best identified as *ḥăḵāmîm*, "sages" (Fonrobert & Jaffee 2007, 3).
[47] Gafni 1984, 16–20; Schiffman 2003, 292.
[48] Schiffman 2003, 293; for encyclopedic information as well as the supposed genealogy of *tannāʾîm*, see Sperber 2007b.
[49] Fonrobert & Jaffee 2007, 4; Schiffman 2003, 293–297.
[50] Schiffman 2003, 294; for a concise introduction to the Mišna, see Wald 2007a.
[51] Schiffman 2003, 301–305.
[52] Sg. *sēder*.
[53] Sg. masēḵâ; Schiffman 2003, 305.

In addition to legalistic exegetic material, *hălāḵâ*,[54] mainly forming the content of the Mišna, composed in elegant Hebrew, some tannaitic traditions contained stories, legends, and interpretations, providing general guidance for the Jewish community. This part of the tradition is known as *aggādâ*,[55] comprising the non-halakhic material of rabbinic traditions.[56] The bipartite tradition corpus was further textualized both in *Tôseftāʾ* (Tosefta), "addition" to the Mišna – containing *bārāytôt*,[57] *i.e.*, external traditions – and *midrāš*, representing Jewish exegeses of the Scripture.[58] The first literary representations of *midrāšîm* were mainly halakhic,[59] concentrating on commenting the legal portions of the last four books of the Tora.[60]

The tannaitic traditions were further discussed by eight generations (~ 200–500 CE) of *āmôrāʾîm*, "explainers".[61] Their contribution in rabbinic writings seems evident in both Byzantine Palestine and Sassanian Babylonia. Amoraic traditions concerning the meaning and text of the halakhic accounts on earlier compilations form the basis for *Talmûd Yerûšalmî* (Yerušalmi, *i.e.*, Palestinian Talmud) and *Talmûd Bāvlî* (Bavli, *i.e.*, Babylonian Talmud),[62] the latter of which contains a later redactorial voice during a period of *sāvôrāʾîm* and *stammāʾîm*.[63] The literature is characterized with complete diglossia of Hebrew and Aramaic.[64]

During the amoraic period, biblical commentaries were produced as midrašic compilations – for example, *Bərēʾšît Rabbāʾ* (Genesis Rabba) providing verse-by-verse exegeses of Genesis, and *Way-yiqrāʾ Rabbāʾ* (Leviticus Rabba) focusing on a few biblical key words and supplementing them with long interpretive discourses – specifically in Palestine.[65] These texts preserved tannaitic traditions, albeit commented and edited by subsequent amoraic sages. They were rich in aggadic material – in fact, Genesis Rabba is one of the oldest collections of this kind of traditions, mainly provided by the *tannāʾîm*. Aggadic accounts encompass a vast variety

[54] Pl. *hălāḵôt*.
[55] Pl. *aggādôt;* Schiffman 2003, 300.
[56] Borowitz 2006, 1–5; *aggādâ* has also been characterized as "theology-resembling narration" by Borowitz.
[57] Sg. *bārāytāʾ* (Aramaic); for encyclopedic introduction to the Tosefta, see Wald 2007c.
[58] Pl. *midrāšîm*; Schiffman 2003, 307–308. The concept of *midrāš* is discussed in Chapter 4 of the present study.
[59] For encyclopedic introduction to *midrəšêy hălāḵâ*, halakhic exegesis, see Kahana 2007.
[60] Fonrobert & Jaffee 2007, 6; Stemberger 1996, 239–240.
[61] For encyclopedic information as well as the supposed genealogy of *āmôrāʾîm*, see Gray 2007.
[62] Fonrobert & Jaffee 2007, 7–9; for encyclopedic information of the former, see Rabinowitz & Wald 2007, whereas the latter is detailedly introduced in Chapter 5 of the present study.
[63] Rubenstein 2007, 70–73; the redactorial contribution has been attributed to both *sāvôrāʾîm*, deriving from "to reflect, examine, deduce", and *stammāʾîm*, "anonymous", the latter representing a continuum to the amoraic scholars between 500–550 CE so that the contribution of *sāvôrāʾîm* might have been limited as compared to that of *stammāʾîm* (Rubenstein 2005, 344–347). For encyclopedic information on *sāvôrāʾîm*, see Sperber 2007a.
[64] *E.g.*, Hasan-Rokem 2003, 3.
[65] Fonrobert & Jaffee 2007, 7; both Genesis Rabba and Leviticus Rabba are discussed more comprehensively in Chapter 4 of the present study.

of narratives, many of which can also be considered as folk literature, dialogue being an important part of it.[66]

Although the Babylonian Talmud is still the most influential extant piece of rabbinic literature, the process of preservation and interpretation did not stop along its compilation. Post-talmudic individuals and academies continued to both study and explicate the Scripture as well as earlier rabbinic writings. The era (~ 700–1100 CE) has often been named after *gəʾônîm*,[67] the name deriving from *gāʾôn* referring to an eminent religious scholar and judicial authority and the head of an academy. Although these academies first occurred in Babylonia, they later spread wider in the Jewish world.[68]

In a study by Jacob Neusner, an influential scholar of rabbinic literature, rabbinic Judaism is divided into four consecutive stages, beginning with the Pentateuch, and ending with the Babylonian Talmud about a thousand years later. Three of the stages can be seen marked by distinct and coherent text compilations.[69] After the first stage, characterized as finding its complete statement in the Pentateuch, the second stage comprised a long period of oral traditions ending up in the Mišna about 600 years later.[70] The third stage emerged alongside the Mišna, the supplementary collections of law, Tosefta, and scriptural exegesis, *midrāš*.[71] Fourth, the Mišna was further clarified and augmented by the two talmudic compilations, Yerušalmi and Bavli.[72] Importantly, later writings always built upon the earlier ones.[73] Therefore, Jewish interpretative tradition – in a more general sense – is likely to represent similar kinds of consecutive stages. The present study, however, expands this continuum until early medieval times.

[66] Hasan-Rokem 2003, 5; for a systematic study of folklore in rabbinic literature, see Ginzberg *et al.* 2003, and for the depiction of female creation in these Jewish legends, see pp. 64–68.
[67] For encyclopedic information as well as genealogy of *gəʾônîm*, see Brand *et al.* 2007.
[68] Brand *et al.* 2007, 380; the era and its typical features are introduced in Chapter 6 of the present study.
[69] Neusner 1999, 6.
[70] Neusner 1999, 10–54.
[71] Neusner 1999, 55–77.
[72] Neusner 1999, 78–96.
[73] Neusner 1999, 6.

2. Material & Methods – Feminist Critical Discourse Analysis of Rabbinic Discource

The formation of religious interpretive tradition is a complex process involving both written and oral sources. Later annotations are always built upon earlier accounts on the matter under discussion. Some details are lost whereas others may be altered – in addition, material can also be added. The plasticity of this process, transformation through transmission, has long been noted. Jewish interpretive tradition is not an exception to this, as can be easily seen within rabbinic literature.[74] Furthermore, rabbinic discourse on the creation of woman does not deviate from this fundamental assumption. Context-dependent (re)readings of the biblical passage understood as the creation of woman have enabled explications conniving asymmetry in gender hierarchy and affecting the legal status of women, often seen as subordinate to men.[75]

2.1. Aim of the Study

The present study was designed to examine the diachronic development of rabbinic interpretations concentrating on a relatively short biblical passage, the creation of woman. This passage serves as a general tool in assessing the evolution of rabbinic discourse, aimed at finding consecutive discursive stages with self-dependent characteristics. As the selected part of the Hebrew Bible deals with women, the focus is at gender-sensitive reading of the texts, specifically addressing the potential accumulation of misogynous elements along these stages. Rabbinic literature discussing the matter is analyzed paying attention to the all-encompassing patriarchal ethos, taking into account both contentual and linguistic features.

2.2. Selection and Description of Rabbinic Material

The rabbinic texts analyzed in the present study were found with the help of a vast variety of research literature, especially that presented in Chapter 3. A great number of rabbis' discussions and elaborations on the creation of human were considered, and the passages specifically enlightening the creation of woman were selected from among them. The study focuses on the time period of most voluminous rabbinic writings, the timeframe being from the 5th to the 9th century, based on the estimated dating of the compilations. The frame was adjusted so that it begins from the first Late-antiquity rabbinic discussions concerning the creation of woman and

[74] Kister 2015, VII.
[75] For a closer insight into the reception of female creation and the first woman in Judaism, Christianity and Islam, see Kvam *et al.* 1999.

yet encompasses the early medieval processing of the traditions, however, not extending to the great Jewish commentaries produced later in the Middle Ages.

Due to the nature of the rabbinic texts presenting different traditions on each matter under discussion, it is impossible to trace the exact dating of each piece of religious knowledge present in them. Although most of the traditions are assigned to named rabbis, many of whom seem to be historical figures, their real roles behind the sayings cannot be ascertained.[76] In addition, most passages have a history of oral transmission before their textual appearance.[77] The compilations, in turn, are not ascribed to any known person.[78] This may reflect the highly valued status of oral Tora and the fact that all rabbinic writings were considered to be parts of it. Equivalently, no clear statements about the dating of each text are given. In fact, rabbinic writings can be seen as statements of consensus, and named ascriptions should most likely be understood as exemplary, not as individual or schismatic.[79]

Regardless of the origin of the traditions and their potential attributions to specific sages, the editorial contribution in rabbinic texts is connected with the context of the compilation. Thus, the selection process and the editorial work were naturally performed at a certain time and in a specific location. The texts selected for the present study are, therefore, analyzed in units each representing a certain time period, discursive stage. However, it has been noted that estimating the timing of each phase is still an educated guess.

The texts from the first phase (5th century) addressed in this study mainly present traditions of the *tannāʾîm*, the chosen accounts being from Genesis Rabba and Leviticus Rabba, two well-known pieces of *Midrāš Rabbāʾ*. The next discursive stage (6th century) comprises a great number of traditions attributable to both *tannāʾîm* and *āmôrāʾîm*, collected into a gigantic compilation of the Babylonian Talmud. Third (7th–9th centuries), four different kinds of rabbinic writings – *Targûm Yerûšalmî* (Targum Pseudo-Jonathan), *Āvôt də-Rabbî Nātān* (Avot de-Rabbi Nathan), *Pirqêy də-Rabbî Ĕlîʿezer* (Pirkei de-Rabbi Eliezer), and *Ālefbêt də-Bēn Sîrāʾ* (Alphabet of Ben Sira) – were chosen to represent the era of *gəʾônîm*, serving as the last discursive stage of this study.

[76] Individual passages can be dated on the basis of redactional-critical and tradition-critical criteria only in a relative sense (Fonrobert & Jaffee 2007, 2).
[77] Fonrobert & Jaffee 2007, 2; it is worth noting that there are neither external historical nor biographical references to the sages, and the extant fragmentary biographical – or rather hagiographical – information is often conflicting with parallel sources.
[78] Neusner 1995, 93, 110; Fonrobert & Jaffee 2007, 2.
[79] Neusner 1995, 110–111.

Nearly all of the passages finally selected for the study are in the most common form of rabbinic accounts, discussions based on a biblical verse or a specific theme. Of these compilations, only Targum Pseudo-Jonathan and Alphabet of Ben Sira do not follow the dialectic formulation typical for rabbinic literature. All of the passages examined in the study were read in their original languages: Hebrew, Aramaic, and mixtures of the two. It is worth noting that language of the writings was heavily influenced by the surrounding culture, and particularly Greek loan words are frequent. English translations were available for all of the texts, except for Alphabet of Ben Sira, and they were consulted in case of ambiguous details in original expressions. The rabbinic works selected for this study were compiled in either one of the two centers of the Jewish world, Palestine or Babylonia. Genesis Rabba, Leviticus Rabba, and Targum Pseudo-Jonathan – most likely also Avot de-Rabbi Nathan and Pirkei de-Rabbi Eliezer – were products of Palestine, whereas the Babylonian Talmud and Alphabet of Ben Sira were compiled in Babylonia. However, there was obvious circulation of traditions between the two geographical locations.

2.3. Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework of the present study is best described as feminist critical discourse analysis drawing upon discourse and gender theories. Both of them have been widely studied and developed during the past three decades. They are heavily influenced by both poststructuralism and social constructionism.[80] The latter has been characterized as offering radical and critical alternatives in psychology and social psychology, but it also serves as a novel approach more widely, specifically in social sciences and humanities. It questions all taken-for-granted ways of understanding the world. Furthermore, the ways in which people mainly perceive the world, including the categories and concepts used, are historically and culturally specific, products of the culture and history in which they occur.[81] This contextuality is an important stance in the present study which focuses on texts among Jewish communities over a millennium ago.

From Construction of Gender to Discursive Representations of Power

Since the rise of the women's movement in the sixties, feminist thought has become a widely used perspective in academic scholarship. It has invaded specifically political and social sciences as well as humanities.[82] Among a variety of other issues, feminist thought has provoked

[80] Thoroughly introduced in Williams 2014 and Burr 2015, respectively.
[81] Burr 2014, 1–4.
[82] For a short introduction to feminism, see Powell 2013.

interest in the concept of "gender". Gender has become understood as a social construct – something that people do in spoken or written discourse.[83] Thus, gender theories are built upon the basis provided by social constructionism.

Although the words "sex" and "gender" are often used synonymically, the former mainly refers to biological distinction between male and female individuals according to their reproducetive organs. Gender, in turn, can be seen as interaction between the society and an individual member of it.[84] In fact, some scholars understand gender solely as a socially constructed identity. Instead of male and female individuals, gender points to differences between masculine and feminine behaviors,[85] regarding which there are widely accepted social conventions, strongly depending on the context.[86] Gender ideology is often hegemonic so that it is considered consensual and widely accepted by most people in a given community.[87] Although according to queer theories sex and gender don't necessarily match with the cultural expectations, [88] the concept of gender was most likely simply a dichotomous choice for the rabbis.

According to social-constructionist ideology, language is an essential parameter in human thought. People are born into a world of pre-existing conceptual frameworks and categories which are determined by language. It is also an essential form of social action. Thus, language can be seen as a constructive force which is at the focus of studies motivated by social constructionism. Instead on being two separate phenomena which can affect each other, language and thought should be seen inseparable. It has also been suggested that language constructs rather than represents the world.[89] In addition, it shapes the concept of gender.[90] It is not surprising that discourse has also gained specific attention in the theory.

Language is much more than a representation of the external world.[91] It is part of the social reality being in constant dialectic relationship with other parts of human life.[92] According to poststructuralist thought, meanings carried by language are never fixed – instead, they are contestable and temporary, even changing over time.[93] Language is, indeed, tightly connected

[83] Sunderland 2004, 14–20.
[84] Baker 2008, 3–4.
[85] Baker 2008, 4.
[86] Sunderland 2004, 17.
[87] Lazar 2007, 147.
[88] Baker 2008, 5.
[89] Burr 2015, 10, 28, 72; for further information on the role of language in social constructionism, see Burr 2015, 52–72.
[90] Litosseliti & Sunderland 2002, 5–6.
[91] Phillips & Hardy 2002, 6.
[92] Fairclough 2004, 2; this work provides linguistic insight into discourse analysis (introduced below), in particular.
[93] Burr 2015, 61–63.

with the social context of its use.[94] Existing interpretations of reality can, in turn, shape language use.[95] It inevitably provokes causal effects on people, their social relations, and actions. This process of meaning-making establishes, maintains, and changes representations of power and domination.[96] Power works through discourse in ways which may result in material and theoretical implications for people's lives.[97]

As the use of language is always located in time and space, "discourse" is also historically produced and interpreted.[98] Defining the concept of discourse and the way it should be analyzed has been a challenging task for the scientific community. Scholars still lack a consensus upon which they could draw.[99] Furthermore, the term is often used in conflicting ways.[100] It can, for instance, be defined as praxis which not only represents the world, but also constructs and shapes it.[101] Discourse is essential in constructing ideas, social processes and features of our lived reality.[102] It can also impact the normalization of ideas about sex and gender.[103] Discourse can, in fact, be both gendered and gendering.[104]

Discourses always appear in specific historical contexts. Therefore, they have to be studied with proper knowledge of the given time and place. The context also defines which part of the discourse, if any, is considered meaningful.[105] It is worth noting that all discourse is intertextual by nature,[106] and every new text is influenced by other texts produced before it.[107] These basic principles, particularly important from the perspective of the present study, have been carefully considered along with the analyses below.

Critical Discourse Analysis

Discourse analysis brings together critical theories and the concept of discourse.[108] The term encompasses different approaches from among social and cognitive study of language, also

[94] Fairclough 1995, 189.
[95] Fairclough 2001, 30–34.
[96] Fairclough 2004, 9.
[97] Fairclough 1995, 1–2.
[98] Wodak & Meyer 2001.
[99] Jørgensen & Phillips 2002, 1–3.
[100] von Stuckrad 2013, 7.
[101] Fairclough 1992, 3; this work is a classic text regarding critical discourse analysis (introduced below), focusing on the theoretical framework rather than practical analyses.
[102] Phillips & Hardy 2002, 6.
[103] Butler 1993, 1; the relationship between gender and discourse is elaborately presented by J. Sunderland (2004).
[104] Sunderland 2004, 20–22.
[105] Jørgensen & Phillips 2002, 5, 102–104.
[106] Wodak 1997, 6.
[107] Fairclough 1995, 2.
[108] Cramer 2009, 326.

combining textual analysis with other modes of social studies.[109] Discourse analysis is often divided into critical (CDA) and analytic ways to address the primary interest of this theoretical framework, although choosing between them is mainly a question of stress on either side.[110]

There is no rigid background theory or distinctive methodology in CDA. Although it does not offer a concrete set of analytical tools, it provides an interdisciplinary framework to widely examine social and political aspects of language use.[111] It has been used in a wide set of scholarly fields, including gender studies.[112] The methodology in discourse-analytical studies varies from philological to both qualitative and quantitative methods.[113] Furthermore, Study of religion and Exegetics have also benefitted from this novel approach as described below.

CDA can be defined as a technique in which the main focus is on the way in which power, dominance and inequality are mixed in a text or a speech of the particular context.[114] Especially sociologists of knowledge often include the dimension of power and the importance of politics in their discourse-analytical research.[115] CDA examines discursive praxis affecting or representing social structures and ideologies.[116] It has, in fact, been characterized as "a resource in social and political struggles for equality and justice".[117] Analysts approach their data with the purpose to discover what has been said or written and what is the social repercussion of these actions.[118] As CDA aims at addressing hidden structures in language, it serves as a tool in identifying damaging gender discourses, among others.[119] This is important since dominant structures tend to stabilize conventions and even naturalize them.[120] Power relations are also an important parameter in the present study which examines the role of language in upholding gender-based social asymmetry in the Jewish community.

There is a distinct focus on power and dominance in CDA. Discourse structures both establish and maintain inequality and injustice.[121] The relationship between language and power – both subtle and obvious – is relevant in CDA. All research utilizing CDA is problem-oriented with a shared interest in demystifying power and ideologies by systematic investigation

[109] Phillips & Hardy 2002, 19–22.
[110] Fairclough 1992, 12.
[111] *E.g.*, Blommaert 2005, 5–6; Fairclough 1992, 12–36; van Dijk 2001; Wodak & Meyer 2001, 14–29.
[112] Fairclough 2001, ix; von Stuckrad 2013, 9.
[113] von Stuckrad 2013, 14–15.
[114] van Dijk 2001.
[115] von Stuckrad 2013, 8.
[116] Phillips & Hardy 2002, 19–22.
[117] Fairclough 2001, x.
[118] Jørgensen & Phillips 2002, 5–6.
[119] Sunderland 2004, 11.
[120] Wodak & Meyer 2001, 3.
[121] Cramer 2009, 326.

of semiotic data, for example, texts. Attention is paid to the way in which dominance, discrimination, power, and control manifest in language make interconnected matters, and the consequentiality of discourse, seen.[122]

In addition to obvious matters, CDA as a critical method takes into consideration invisible features, as well. This is particularly important because discursive, social, and cultural changes may not always be explicitly observable.[123] Although some scholars have underrated the role of linguistic features potentially having societal effects,[124] CDA can benefit from textual analysis. Attention on linguistic and intertextual matters is likely to improve CDA-based research.[125]

The theoretical framework of CDA can be subdivided based on micro or macro levels as the main focus of the analyses performed. Macro level concentrates on the context whereas the so-called micro level focuses on the actual text, the latter being called critical linguistic analysis. It should be noted, however, that the levels serve as a continuum, not necessitating a dichotomous choice between them.[126] For example, as CDA depicts language as social practice, it is indispensable to consider the contexts of language use to some extend.[127]

The discipline of Study of religion has lately started to utilize CDA in a growing, albeit still a scarce manner.[128] Many of the contributions base themselves on linguistic and textual analyses of discourse, but CDA has been depicted as a research perspective, also providing a powerful tool in discourse-historical analysis of religion. As tacit knowledge, which is often not challenged, can change remarkably from one community to another and from one historical era to another, historical analysis of discourse deals specifically with this implicit part of knowledge, in addition to the explicitly available part of it.[129] As the present study was designed to address the overall conceptions of the Jewish sages, it inexorably takes this hidden information into account.

CDA has been shown to provide a tool for examining how biblical interpretations are compounded, shaped, and negotiated in a given community. The interpreter's subjectivity has

[122] Wodak & Meyer 2001, 2, 14.
[123] Fairclough 1992, 9.
[124] Fairclough 2001, 30–34.
[125] Fairclough 1995, 188; for comprehensive insight specifically into linguistic aspects of discourse analysis, see Gee & Handford, 2011.
[126] Phillips & Hardy 2002, 19–22.
[127] Wodak & Meyer 2001, 1–2.
[128] von Stuckrad 2013; in addition to the paper by Kocku von Stuckrad (2013), Tituts Hjelm's concise chapter (2011) on discourse analysis introduces the position of CDA in the Study of religion.
[129] von Stuckrad 2013, 6–10.

only recently gained attention, and biblical interpretation is not an exception to this. However, exegeses can be depicted as interaction between the actors of a given context, also shaping the mores of the community.[130] It is worth noting that the discipline of Exegetics is most often concerned with texts – thus, the role of CDA in this scholarship is often what Norman Fairclough, a pioneering voice of CDA, calls "textually oriented discourse analysis".[131] Instead of being solely a research perspective, it may therefore serve as a *de facto* method in the present study, deeply immersed in textual tradition.

Feminist CDA

Critical discourse analysis has been noted to be a valuable framework in exploring gender matters.[132] Actually, by taking political stance and paying attention to social inequality, the agenda of CDA can be automatically considered feminist.[133] Although the concept of feminist CDA became more widely known when Michelle Lazar published a pioneering volume on the matter in 2005, many clearly discourse-analytical studies that strongly relate to feminist theory do not specify their theoretical framework as namely "feminist CDA". Meanwhile, there is a growing number of studies that openly adhere to it.

It has been argued that gender should be seen as an ever-present category in all social practice. Discourses maintain unfair dichotomies dividing people into hierarchical categories of which the "men" are seen as a dominant group whereas the "women" remain a subordinate ensemble. Power relations tend to systematically disempower women as a social group.[134] Feminist CDA challenges this *status quo* by putting special, even explicit, focus on gendered assumptions in discourse.

Feminist CDA draws upon poststructuralist conceptions of discourse as socially constitutive praxis where discourse and the social are dialectically related.[135] Its goals have been broadly characterized as social transformation and emancipation.[136] Feminist CDA aims at showing the ways in which "gendered assumptions and hegemonic power relations are discursively produced, sustained, negotiated, and challenged in different contexts and communi-

[130] Warhol 2007, 51–52; for an illustrative case-study on the phenomenon, see the entire paper by Warhol.
[131] Fairclough 1992, 37–61.
[132] Jule 2007, 3.
[133] Lazar 2005, 2–4.
[134] Lazar 2005, 2–7.
[135] Lazar 2007, 149.
[136] Lazar 2005, 6.

ties".[137] It critiques discourses maintaining patriarchal social order, assuming that power and dominance can be discursively resisted. Critical discourse studies with a gender focus most often present a critical view on gender relations so that they are motivated by the need to change them.[138] Feminist CDA often focuses on the ways in which analyses of institutionally produced discourse can be used to create change within those institutions.[139] This activist agenda, however, cannot be directly taken into account in the present study dealing with texts produced more than a thousand years earlier.

Besides feminist CDA, there are a few other feministically affiliated research approaches addressing language and discourse.[140] For example, conversation analysis, inspired by sociolinguistics, poststructuralist discourse analysis, and transversal discourse analysis have been used in feminist research settings. In addition, feminist linguistics analyze the relationship between language and gender from its self-dependent perspective.[141] Of these approaches, all of which are quite closely related to feminist CDA, feminist poststructuralist discourse analysis (FPDA) was emphatically considered as a potential theoretical framework of the present study. However, as FPDA downplays the commitment of CDA to focusing on oppression and concentrates more on the interactive nature of discourse,[142] it does not suit the material analyzed in this study. Multidimensional dynamics of the discourse, also taking the potential female voice into account, cannot be reached in texts written exclusively by men over a millennium ago. In turn, the selected texts represent a history of gendered discourses potentially sustaining patriarchal social order, which seems to be best addressed from the perspective of feminist CDA in the present study.

Genealogy

Besides analyzing rabbinic discourse in Late Antiquity from a feminist perspective, the present study was designed to examine the diachronic development of rabbinic interpretations based on the biblical passage known as the creation of woman. As the trajectory is likely to represent a historical lineage, it can be studied using a genealogical approach. The term "genealogy" was first introduced into philosophical discourse by the German philologist Friedrich Nietzsche in

[137] Lazar 2007, 142.
[138] Lazar 2005, 2–10.
[139] Lazar 2007, 152–153.
[140] Kroløkke & Sørensen 2006, 47–62.
[141] Wodak 2015, 700.
[142] Sauntson 2012, 124–127; for a comprehensive introduction to FPDA, see Judith Baxter's pioneering contribution published in 2003.

the 1880's.[143] The method was later made famous by the French sociologist Michel Foucault,[144] using it for a critical historical-philosophical research setting. Genealogy historicizes things that have no significant earlier history – it can also be seen as a form of writing history.[145]

Genealogy can be thought of as reconstruction of historical development examining the way power has influenced the formation of understanding.[146] Genealogical ethos can enhance critical discourse-analytic approach specifically in connection with historical textual sources.[147] As a matter of fact, this combination has been successfully used in connection with Islamic interpretive tradition.[148] Thus, it is likely to provide a salutary tool in assessing the evolution of Jewish exegeses, as well. This hypothesis formed the basis for the analyses puddled into three discursive stages as presented in the subheadings of chapters 4–6 in the present study.

Rabbinic Discourse

Rabbinic texts are discourse as they are. The compositions have been predominantly produced so that each topic or biblical verse to be explained is dealt with providing sayings, teachings, and opinions of the sages to elucidate the matter under discussion. These discussions also contain objections and disagreements. Although many academic studies address the rabbinic discourse, so far it has not been systematically approached within the theoretical framework of critical discourse analysis, nor the feminist version of it. In addition, its diachronic development has only been addressed in a small number of studies, although the material would potentially enable such assessments.

[143] Saar 2002, 231–233.
[144] Gutting 2005, 50–58.
[145] Saar 2002, 231–234.
[146] Saar 2008, 295.
[147] Anaïs 2013, 123–135.
[148] Abou-Bakr 2015; von Schöneman 2018.

3. Literature Review – Approaches to Rabbinic Concept of Female Creation

Women, as producers or subjects of knowledge, have been invisible in academia for centuries, specifically in religious studies. For the past decades, however, feminist scholarship has been an exponentially growing field in Jewish studies. Gender-sensitive approach has reached just about all its disciplines ranging from classical to modern subjects. The first step in this development was critique, *i.e.*, systematic study, and the process continued with an attempt to awaken consciousness on women's matters by examining their lives within the framework provided by male scholarship. Only the third stage of the development has positioned women as key actors in research concerning themselves.[149]

The Hebrew Bible has been approached from a feminist perspective by a countless number of scholars during the past decades. Androcentric readings of the Bible have been questioned and its fundamentally patriarchal context has been investigated. In addition, novel receptions of this ancient scripture have been demanded from both theological and academic perspectives.[150] This has also been applied to the creation of woman in the Bible which has been studied from an egalitarian perspective by a rapidly growing number of scholars. One of the most ground-breaking writings has been provided by Phyllis Trible claiming to depatriarchalize biblical interpretation, thus, reading the creation narratives from the perspective of feminist cultural criticism.[151] In addition, the primal woman, Eve, has been addressed from a feminist perspective in studies by David Clines,[152] Ilana Pardes,[153] and Phyllis Bird,[154] just to mention a few of the most influential ones.

3.1. Short Excursion into Feminist Approaches in Rabbinic Studies

A growing amount of scholars have recently focused on women's affairs in rabbinic literature.[155] The first step, later enabling gender-sensitive academic agendas as well, was the growing interest toward critical talmudic studies among Jewish study circles, *yəšîvôt*,[156] usually con-

[149] Davidman & Tenenbaum 1994, 1–2; for a cross-cut of this development, see the entire introductory chapter.
[150] For exemplary introductions to feminist scholarship in biblical studies, see Frymer-Kensky 1994, Fuchs 2008, Scholz 2013, and Yee 2018, 7–31.
[151] Trible 1983; the first edition was published in 1978.
[152] Clines 1990, 25–65.
[153] Pardes 1992, 13–38.
[154] Bird 1997, 183–196; the most important part from the perspective of the present study, *Male and Female He Created Them*, was published as an article in 1981.
[155] For a concise review of the beginning of the scholarship, see Alexander 2000.
[156] Sg. *yəšîvâ*; a school in which rabbinic literature, specifically the Talmud, is studied by devoted male students.

centrating on religious learning based on the Talmud and the Tora.[157] During the latter half of the 20th century, pioneering work was done by Jacob Neusner, having produced a massive literary output on the field, who is said to have laid the foundation for gender-sensitive readings of rabbinic literature.[158] The scholarship of feminist rabbinic studies grew rapidly,[159] and the following review provides only a brief overview of its evolution during the last two decades of the 20th century, introducing some well-known exemplary studies.[160]

Some of the earliest contributions to the field of gender-sensitive rabbinic studies were Rachel Biale's *Women and Jewish Law: An Exploration of Women's Issues in Halakhic Sources* (1984), and Judith Baskin's *The Separation of Women in Rabbinic Judaism* (1985). Nehama Aschkenasy's pioneering work, *Eve's Journey: Feminine Images in Hebraic Literary Tradition*, was published shortly after them in 1986. The focus of Aschkenasy's study is at various textual sources within Judaism, also providing insight into rabbinic literature. She aims at following an archetypal feminine figure "as it travels through generations and cultures".[161] Furthermore, Aschkenasy attempts to divulge the ancient roots of female distress and male prejudices as well as to trace the changing cultural concepts of women. From the perspective of the present study, her diachronic approach is of special interest. In spite of its name, however, the study addresses the creation of woman only sporadically.[162]

Judith Wegner's work *Chattel or Person? The Status of women in the Mishnah* was first published in 1988.[163] The study serves more as a historical description of the topic, legal status of women, and the approach can be depicted as neutral on ideological level. However, the author clearly engages in Jewish feminism. Wegner concludes that the position of women in the mišnaic system was "neither a romantically better past nor an endless tale of female subjugation and male triumph".[164] Thus, the answer to the question presented in the name of her book is "neither".

The first half of the 1990's raised a growing amount of gender-sensitive studies on rabbinic sources, specifically addressing the question of where and how rabbinic culture structured

[157] Fonrobert 2005, 465–466; Hauptman 1994, 40–41.
[158] Hauptman 1994, 43–50.
[159] In part as a response to Christian feminist critique (Heschel 1992).
[160] For Finnish readers interested in gender perspectives of rabbinic writings, there is an excellent review on the matter by Riikka Tuori (2019).
[161] Aschkenasy 1986, 5.
[162] Most importantly in Aschkenasy 1986, 10–12.
[163] Wegner 1988; see also her more general study *The Image and Status of Women in Classical Rabbinic Judaism* published in 1991.
[164] Wegner 1988, 182–198.

gender. For example, Shaye Cohen concluded in his paper *Menstruants and the Sacred in Judaism and Christianity* (1991) that the rhetoric of impurity in rabbinic literature served to justify, even strengthen the predominant order where women were marginalized.[165] Furthermore, Daniel Boyarin addressed the rabbinic discourse of the body and sexuality in his classic *Carnal Israel: Reading Sex in Talmudic Culture*, originally published in 1993.[166] The overall ethos of this work aimed at liberating modern Jewish women from their long-lived subordinate status. Furthermore, Boyarin challenged the field of rabbinic studies encouraging a shift from theoretical framework towards hermeneutical possibilities, utilizing recent academic developments.[167]

Interestingly, Boyarin argued that misogynous views of women and their pernicious proclivities are, after all, rare in rabbinic literature.[168] Similarly, Judith Hauptman concluded in her *Rereading the Rabbis: A Woman's Voice* (1998) that misogynous notions are balanced by favorable accounts on women.[169] Michael Satlow also noted that rabbinic culture was not monolithic. For instance, reinforcement of gender relationships was only one of the social functions of rabbinic sources.[170]

The latter half of the 1990's invoked an exponentially growing series of studies with in-depth engagement and critical reading of specific rabbinic texts, and exploring different topics and their appearances throughout the literature.[171] For example, Miriam Peskowitz's *Spinning Fantasies: Rabbis, Gender, and History* (1997) provided a thorough analysis on gender by examining archeological remains, biblical and rabbinic texts, as well as Greek and Roman writings. Tal Ilan, in turn, promoted finding the female history of rabbinic literature using traditional methods, specifically philology, in her *Mine and Yours are Hers: Retrieving Women's History from Rabbinic Literature* (1997). She demonstrates a misogynous development in rabbinic writings over time – for example, the positive role of a rabbi Akiva's wife was narrowed as the mišnaic tradition ended up in the Talmud.[172]

Charlotte Fonrobert's study *Menstrual Purity: Rabbinic and Christian Reconstructions of Biblical Gender* (2000) shifted the methodology of gender-sensitive rabbinic studies away from thematic approach. In her study addressing talmudic concerns with the female body, the

[165] Cohen 1991, 291.
[166] Boyarin 1995, 19–20; Secunda 2012, 60–61.
[167] Secunda 2012, 60–61; for Boyarin's later achievements in the field, see Wimpfheimer 2011.
[168] Boyarin 1995, 88–90.
[169] Hauptman 1998, 9.
[170] Satlow 1996, 296–297; his main work *Tasting the Dish: Rabbinic Rhetorics of Sexuality* was published in 1995.
[171] Raveh 2014, xxi.
[172] Ilan 1997, 292–293; a few years before this study, Ilan published a famous study called *Jewish Women in Greco-Roman Palestine* (Ilan 1994a).

author focuses on a relatively limited number of texts, however, quoting them extensively and analyzing them thoroughly, also providing gender-sensitive discussion on them.

3.2. Creation of Woman in Rabbinic Literature

Along with the development of gender-sensitive approach in rabbinic studies, the creation of woman also began to be addressed in conjunction with rabbinic literature. The matter has been briefly introduced by Gary Anderson as a part of his study regarding the garden of Eden and sexuality in early Judaism. He tackles the actual creation account in connection with marriage, introducing passages from Genesis Rabba, Bavli, Avot de-Rabbi Nathan, and Targum Pseudo-Jonathan.[173] As a whole, however, the author mainly concentrates on the sexual life of the primeval couple and rabbinic attitudes toward celibacy. In Anderson's later study on Adam and Eve in Jewish and Christian imagination, he refers to scattered rabbinic accounts on the matter, also in connection with the creation.[174]

Interpretative conceptions of the primal woman have been examined as part of Carol Meyers' well-known work, first published in 1988 with the name *Discovering Eve: Ancient Israelite Women in Context*, and 24 years later as an edited version of the previous study, *Rediscovering Eve: Ancient Israelite Women in Context*. Meyers' study addresses "Everywoman Eve", the ordinary women of ancient Israel, in connection with the Eden narrative. She examines these topics in the light of feminism and social science research. As a part of her study, the author investigates the reception of Genesis 2–3 among the first Jewish and Christian communities, providing a brief overview of different traditions among them, also addressing the creation of woman.[175] She claims that these early sources interpreted and emphasized certain features of the biblical passages expressing their thoughts on creation, gender, sex, and sin.[176] However, Meyers barely mentions rabbinic literature.[177]

Leila Bronner's preliminary work on rabbinic reconstructions of biblical women covers, in accordance with its name *From Eve to Esther: Rabbinic Reconstructions of Biblical Women* (1994), the stories of several well-known female figures in the Hebrew Bible. Bronner is interested in the aggadic lore rather than legalistic matters, introducing aggadic attitudes toward

[173] Anderson 1992, 50–54.
[174] Anderson 2001.
[175] Meyers 2012, 59–80.
[176] Meyers 2012, 60.
[177] For a brief conclusion dealing with rabbinic reception of gender issues, see Meyers 2012, 205.

women, mainly in Genesis Rabba and the Bavli.[178] Among others, she also addresses the first woman, Eve.[179] Bronner examines Eve's name, specifically in connection with negative connotations, and rabbis' ways of reconciling the two biblical creation accounts. She shows how the rabbinic traditions concerning Eve were used to construct the category of "women", including their ritual obligations and highly-valued modesty. The author concludes that although some open-minded views on women are present in rabbinic literature, its overall ethos is constricted with these regards.[180]

Creation and gender in rabbinic literature has been examined in John Townsend's study addressing Genesis Rabba, Bavli, and *Midrāš Tanḥûmā'*, in particular.[181] The author introduces rabbinic views on the creation of woman by citing several different passages from the aforementioned texts, also noting parallels to them. He concludes that there is obviously a lot of misogyny in rabbinic writings, but there is also a margin of traditions that are more sympathetic towards women.[182] Townsend's study provides a cross-cut of different types of rabbinic traditions concerning the primal couple. He attempts to contextualize the unfavorable ones so that they must have been a male response to increasing female influence in the Jewish community.

Eve, the primal woman, is addressed in connection with Daniel Boyarin's best-seller, already mentioned above. In his work, Boyarin discusses corporeality in rabbinic Judaism, specifically addressing its socio-historical-philosophical context. As a part of the discourse on marital sex, myths of female origins are also dealt with. The author concludes that the rabbinic culture, a resistance movement against Hellenism, was gender-asymmetric – women are seen as "enablers of men by providing for their sexual and procreative needs".[183] Boyarin suggests that Philo's explication on the two accounts concerning human creation, seeing the "first woman" as misfortune and "the second woman" as ontologically secondary to man, served as an essential basis for subsequent rabbinic interpretations. However, he claims that the rabbinic discourse on gender is inaccurately seen solely as misogynous.[184]

Rabbinic interpretations on the story of Eve and Adam are presented as a part of an anthological work on Jewish, Christian, and Muslim readings on Genesis and gender by Kristen Kvam, Linda Schearing, and Valerie Ziegler. The authors provide a collection of thematically

[178] Bronner 1994, 1–21.
[179] Bronner 1994, 22–41.
[180] Bronner 1994, 185.
[181] *Midrāš Tanḥûmā'* is the name given to three different collections of *aggādôt* on the Pentateuch.
[182] Townsend 1994, 9.
[183] Boyarin 1995, 77–106.
[184] Boyarin 1995, 77–80.

arranged traditions from midrašic, talmudic and targumic sources. In addition, within the time-frame of this study, some accounts from Avot de-Rabbi Nathan, Pirkei de-Rabbi Eliezer, and Alphabet of Ben Sira are also given. Kvam and her co-authors attempt to show that the earlier themes appear in medieval collections with significant reworkings. In addition, new themes are introduced in later interpretive tradition.[185] They refrain from offering thorough analyses of the passages and rather concentrate on organizing them based on traditions, dating, and themes.

A study by Lieve Teugels examines the creation of human in rabbinic literature, also providing insight into the creation of woman. She discusses the ways the rabbis used to adjust the two different biblical accounts on human creation, providing rabbinic speculations concerning the concept of a primal androgyne. Furthermore, Teugels tackles the figure of Lilith, also mentioning a later elaboration of rabbinic traditions regarding her, Alphabet of Ben Sira. Otherwise, the author thematically investigates selected passages from Genesis Rabba and the Bavli, making short excursions into Targum Pseudo-Jonathan and Pirkei de-Rabbi Eliezer in connection with Gen. 2:7.[186] She suggests that the passages and themes examined in her study demonstrate the lack of a systematic view on the nature of women, and not the most misogynous type of literary tradition.[187]

Femininity in rabbinic literature has been addressed by Judith Baskin, providing a thorough investigation of the topic in midrašic context. Her ground-breaking work *Midrashic Women: Formations of the Feminine in Rabbinic Literature* (2002) discusses the otherness of women, female disadvantages and their justifications, women as wives, and female infertility. Most importantly from the perspective of this study, she examines midrašic revisions of human creation.[188] Baskin's approach is thematic so that she discusses the "building" process of the first woman and the concept of the first couple as androgyne – this is done through passages from midrašic literature in, most importantly, Genesis Rabba and the Bavli.[189] She also makes a short excursion to the concept of "two Eves".[190] Baskin demonstrates midrašic justifications of women's subordinate status based on the inferior nature of female creation, which is further used to explain the marginalization of females in the ideal society and privileging men.[191]

[185] Kvam *et al.* 1999, 54–79, 134–136.
[186] Teugels 2000, 108–119.
[187] Teugels 2000, 125–126.
[188] Baskin 2002, 44–64; previously more briefly introduced in Baskin 1995.
[189] Baskin 2002, 44–56, 60–64.
[190] Baskin 2002, 56–60.
[191] *E.g.*, Baskin 2002, 49–52.

Traditions of Eve in Genesis Rabba have been addressed by Daphna Arbel in connection with Ezekiel 28:11–19 and the "primal figure", dissident cherub, introduced in it. Arbel's focus is mainly at the inspiration produced by Ez. 28:11–19 which the author considers evident in Genesis Rabba 18:1. She concludes that the conception of gender reflected in the rabbinic source suggests that the image of the first woman is associated with the primary figure in Ezekiel.[192] In the same year of the publication of Arbel's study, Eliezer Segal published his work examining 32 aggadic midrašic passages of the Bavli. From the perspective of this study, the most interesting part of Segal's work, albeit a short one, is the chapter in which the author provides three midrašic interpretations of *ṣelaʿ*. He concludes that the Palestinian variants of the examined tradition seem to be part of a fascinating narrative about the position of humans within the bigger picture of creation, as compared to the version present in the Bavli.[193]

Shai Cherry's study focuses on Jewish interpretations of the Hebrew Bible, addressing several specific topics, the creation of humanity being one of them.[194] His approach is, indeed, rabbinic. He introduces the plurality in Gen. 1:26, the image of God in Gen. 1:27, the concept of feminine in Gen. 1:27, and the potential other wife of Adam. He concludes that the creation of humanity in Genesis 1 must have meant something very different from how it has eventually been read.[195] The matter of female creation, however, is only slightly touched in connection with the concept of Lilith.

Man's potential dominion over woman with reference to the biblical account of Eve's creation from Adam's rib has been studied from an aggadic point of view by Rivon Krygier. The author presents several rabbinic passages concerning the Garden narrative, beginning with the sages' attempt to harmonize the two biblical accounts on creation.[196] He proceeds by giving some well-known traditions from Genesis Rabba and the Bavli, however, later concentrating mainly on the concept of original sin.

Rabbinic conceptions of Eve have been briefly addressed by John Flood as a minor part of his extensive study on representations of Eve in antiquity and the English middle ages. Although he mainly focuses on Christian interpretive tradition, the author makes an excursion into Jewish exegesis. He introduces several passages from Genesis Rabba, discussing them in the light of Christian writings. The author notes that the rabbinic comments around the creation of

[192] Arbel 2005, 655.
[193] Segal 2005, 21–27.
[194] Cherry 2007, 40–71.
[195] Cherry 2007, 189.
[196] Krygier 2007, 69–71.

Eve are mainly negative.[197] In fact, Flood brings up sporadic passages particularly unfavorable to women. The role of women in Christianity has also been addressed in connection with the creation narrative by Barry Fike who briefly mentions a few talmudic and midrašic traditions concerning the creation of woman.[198]

Ziony Zevit's study on the biblical events in Paradise mainly focuses on the so-called "Fall" of human. However, the author shortly addresses the first lady in the light of ancient Mesopotamian and Egyptian motifs, also reassessing the "rib" from which she was allegedly created. He utilizes some rabbinic passages to attest to his far-fetched interpretation that the word *ṣela'* must be associated with male penis. [199] In addition, Zoroastrian and Manichean creation myths in connection with Adam and Eve have recently been addressed by Yishai Kiel.[200] His focus is on reconstructing the primordial couple in the Bavli in the light of syncretic Sasanian culture and mythic parallels present in it. However, the author does not directly address rabbinic accounts on the creation of either human or woman.

Feminist readings of rabbinic sources have been discussed in Inbar Raveh's book accordingly named as *Feminist Rereadings of Rabbinic Literature* (2014). Raveh assumes that gender identities are cultural products that must be learned somewhere – this is, indeed, the way rabbinic legends were generated, reproducing the Jewish image of femininity.[201] Her approach is literary and philosophical, each chapter being devoted to separate subjects. By examining different midrašic texts, she addresses, for example, female sexuality, midwives, and woman's pain in rabbinic contexts. In the last chapter, the author also deals with the creation of woman. Raveh analyzes two parallel versions of a story regarding the creation of woman present in both Genesis Rabba and the Bavli. She poses an interesting question whether the difference between the versions might be related to their contexts so that the more polemical and masculine tone observed in the later version would, thus, reflect the more arduous political situation concerning the Jewish community. [202]

Paul Heger's study *Women in the Bible, Qumran, and Early Rabbinic Literature: Their Status and Roles* (2014) concentrates on the themes of the fall narrative, the father's authority, women's obligations, and polygamy. Most importantly from the perspective of this study, the author lengthily discusses the creation narrative and the status of women related to it. He first

[197] Flood 2010, 39–45.
[198] Fike 2015, 7–8.
[199] Zevit 2013, 101–109.
[200] Kiel 2015; this paper is reproduced in his more comprehensive study on sexuality in the Bavli (Kiel 2016).
[201] Raveh 2014, xix.
[202] Raveh 2014, 145–156.

describes the problems and interpretations concerning the biblical text, proceeding to Qumran's possible understanding of the creation narrative and its legal ramifications. Finally, Heger addresses midrašic interpretations of this narrative, specifically their positive and negative attitudes towards women.[203] He concludes that these accounts are somewhat contrasting and potential favorable portrayals of women are defined by their relationship to men.[204]

The creation of woman in rabbinic literature has been addressed by Wojciech Kosior in his study examining the image of Eve and its influence on the portrayal of Lilith in Alphabet of Ben Sira. The author introduces various traditions concerning both Lilith and Eve in rabbinic sources, finally comparing the two women. He concludes that the image of Lilith in Alphabet of Ben Sira draws upon early rabbinic traditions regarding Eve, suggesting that one of the most important functions of Lilith in it was to promote a favorable image of Eve.[205] Instead of dealing with the creation of woman, Kosior focuses on the discourse concerning the image of these two female figures. Diana Carvalho, in turn, examines the two primal women in Jewish feminist thought, concentrating on the ways Jewish feminism has understood the methods used to interpret the Scripture and the ability of Jewish feminism to cross religious and gender boundaries.[206] Her special interest is in Genesis as well as Alphabet of Ben Sira.

The final part of Rick Brower's recent study, the goal of which he formulates as encouraging "a deeper and more sensitive approach to the creation text of Genesis 1", examines the two biblical creation accounts in connection with Jesus' teachings. Along his excursion into the matter, the author cites a few passages from Genesis Rabba and one from the Bavli, as well.[207] However, Brower simply uses them to attest to his deduction focusing on Jesus' conceptions on marriage and divorce.

3.3. Rabbinic Conceptions of Human Creation

Human creation in rabbinic writings has been studied with an emphasis on Adam in several studies. For example, the story of Adam in paradise from creation to resurrection has been discussed in Emmanouela Grypeou's and Helen Spurling's study in which the authors introduce the twelve hours of Adam in paradise, including his creation, as a widely used rabbinic tradi-

[203] Heger 2014, 11–45.
[204] Heger 2014, 45.
[205] Kosior 2018, 121–123.
[206] Carvalho 2009, ii.
[207] Brower 2018, 184–187.

tion.[208] Adamic traditions in rabbinic literature have also been addressed by Alexander Toepel.[209] Although it includes a large chronological spectrum of rabbinic literature, the author's catalogue-like presentation barely deals with human creation.

Admiel Kosman has performed an extensive study on gender and dialogue from the rabbinic prism, in a concluding chapter of which he also addresses femininity and masculinity in the light of the Hebrew Bible and *midrāš*. His approach is rereading the creation narrative within the framework of psychoanalytical and gender theories.[210] The author attempts to show that the ideal of the male who unifies with his feminine side was a common concept in rabbinic literature. Concentrating in the first creation account as a whole, Kosman briefly tackles the creation of human. Instead of paying attention to rabbinic elaborations on the matter, he mainly investigates the relationship between ancient myths and the first biblical creation narrative.

Rabbinic expansions to the narrative of human creation in Genesis Rabba are introduced by Ryan Dulkin. He concentrates on two chapters of the eight section, *i.e.*, 8:4–5, giving his own translation of the passages. He suggests that these passages offer an ethical-critical reading of Gen. 1:26, advocating mercy and kindness.[211] Rabbinic understanding of the concept of man's creation in "God's image" has also been addressed by Yair Lorberbaum. He concentrates on tannaitic traditions, aiming at reconstructing a comprehensive thought complex based on sayings and homilies within rabbinic, specifically talmudic literature. Although providing frequent passages of early rabbinic literature on Gen. 1:27, he barely mentions the first woman.[212]

A recent paper by Günter Stemberger presents different dimensions of the portrayal of Adam in rabbinic literature. One of these aspects is the concept of the primal being as androgynous, which the author introduces as a tradition mentioned in a couple of rabbinic accounts, obviously affected by the cultural context of the sages.[213] Furthermore, sequences of Adam's creation in early rabbinic literature have recently been addressed in Willem Smelik's paper.[214] His approach is of special interest from the perspective of the present study as he addresses the malleability of traditions by examining passages from the Mišna, Tosefta, and the Bavli. Smelik's focus, however, is on rabbinic interpretations and recontextualization of Gen. 4:10, and he does not immerse in details of the creation account.

[208] Grypeou & Spurling 2013, 40–50.
[209] Toepel 2012, 316–321.
[210] Kosman 2012, 154–213.
[211] Dulkin 2013, 148.
[212] Lorberbaum 2015.
[213] Stemberger 2017, 225–226.
[214] Smelik 2018.

3.4. *Ḥawwâ* in Rabbinic Tradition

In addition to creation, the depiction of the primal woman, Eve, in rabbinic literature has been examined from various other perspectives. Most of the aforementioned studies provide quite a comprehensive excursion into this biblical figure,[215] even exhibiting a feminist approach into the matter. One of the first attempts to investigate the biblical Eve in rabbinic literature was Samuel Lachs' study on Greek Pandora motif which, according to him, appears in rabbinic literature in seven passages. Lachs argues that the sages were familiar with Greek wisdom, and the details of the myth were altered and adapted to accommodate the new setting.[216]

Rachel Adelman's lengthy study on Pirkei de-Rabbi Eliezer provides a brief excursion into its representation of Gen. 3, specifically the "Fall" narrative.[217] Her focus is on examining the primary source as narrative *midrāš,* also in connection with primeval history, but not the primal couple, in particular. Rabbinic conceptions of the primordial woman from the perspective of ancient Jewish interpretations on the divine sentence of Eve (Gen. 3:16) have also been studied by Stephen Andrews.[218] Furthermore, Berel Dov Lerner has recently addressed the rabbinic concept of Eve's ten curses, particularly present in the Bavli, Avot de-Rabbi Nathan, and Pirkei de-Rabbi Eliezer. He discusses them in connection with orthodox Judaism and halakhic obligations.[219]

Natalie Polzer's study on the Eve traditions in Avot de-Rabbi Nathan provides a thorough analysis of misogynous conceptions in the two known versions of this early-medieval rabbinic source.[220] In addition, Eve has been cursorily mentioned in connection with Katie Woolstenhulme's dissertation study examining the role and status of the biblical matriarchs in Genesis Rabba.[221] Biblical stories of women have also been examined by Alice Bellis. Although she provides an entire chapter dedicated to Eve,[222] the author barely mentions rabbinic conceptions of her.

[215] Anderson 1992; 2001; Baskin 2002; Boyarin 1995; Bronner 1994; Cherry 2007; Flood 2010; Heger 2014; Kvam *et al.* 1999; Meyers 2012; Raveh 2014.
[216] Lachs 1974, 342, 345.
[217] Adelman 2009, 71–108.
[218] Andrews 2007.
[219] Lerner 2018.
[220] Polzer 2012.
[221] Woolstenhulme 2017, 100–101, 310, 317.
[222] Bellis 2002, 37–56; the work was originally published in 1994.

4. Establishing Tannaitic Corpus of *Aggādâ – Midrāš Rabbāʾ*

As previously noted, *midrāš* can be understood as interpretation of the Scripture,[223] and the term is not restricted to rabbinic literature – in fact, it can already be detected within the Hebrew Bible.[224] The term *midrāš* can refer to an individual exegetic periscope, to the rabbinic method of biblical interpretation, or to compilations of exegetical statements specifically during Late Antiquity.[225] A great deal of rabbinic literature comprises of *midrāšîm* of different kinds, roughly divided into halakhic and aggadic ones. The concept of human creation, including the appearance of the first woman, it almost exclusively discussed in the latter kinds of traditions, *midrəšêy aggādâ.*

Aggadic traditions classified as *midrāš* can be characterized as a technique utilizing hermeneutical principles to interpret a biblical verse or to link it with extraneous material, such as a saying or a narrative. They were abundantly used particularly during the amoraic period of rabbinic movement,[226] and mainly in Palestine.[227] The so-called amoraic *midrāšîm* comprise, most importantly, exegesis of Genesis and Leviticus as well as the five Scrolls, *məgillôt.*[228] The aim was to present rabbinic thought as derived from scriptural sources, connecting it with biblical precursors.[229] The rabbis seem to have believed that their exegetic activity was part of the revelation begun with Moses, the first "rabbi".[230] Thus, the status of oral Tora was further consolidated along their interpretations.

Midrəšêy aggādâ can be divided into exegetical and homiletic categories, the former consisting of verse-by-verse running commentary accounts and the latter comprising chapters devoted to the interpretation of individual verses.[231] There are no independent texts concentrateing on *midrəšêy aggādâ* from the tannaitic period of rabbinic movement.[232] Therefore, their earliest appearances can be considered as establishing the tannaitic corpus of such.[233]

---

[223] Porton 2004, 520.
[224] Stemberger 1996, 235.
[225] Porton 2004, 520.
[226] Ben-Eliyahu 2012, 78–79.
[227] Herr 2007a, 183; Stemberger 1996, 240.
[228] Sg. *məgillâ; i.e.*, Song of Songs, Book of Ruth, Book of Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, and Book of Esther.
[229] Ben-Eliyahu 2012, 78–79.
[230] Porton 2004, 521.
[231] Ben-Eliyahu 2012, 78–79; Herr 2007a, 183–184; Stemberger 1996, 240.
[232] Herr 2007a, 183.
[233] *Cf.* Mack 1989, 71; this applies specifically to the first composition of aggadic *midrāšîm,* Genesis Rabba, the early appearance of which possibly reflects the absence of earlier rabbinic writings based on Genesis.

In accordance with rabbinic literature as a whole, all *midrāšîm* contain material from diverse time periods.[234] The earliest aggadic *midrāš* collection, Genesis Rabba, can be dated to the beginning of the 5th century. The adjective *rabbāʾ* was originally given to only this Genesis commentary,[235] introduced below, but quite early on, a rabbinic elaboration on Leviticus was also assigned similarly, Leviticus Rabba.[236] Later, *midrāšîm* based on other parts of the Tora, were compiled and eventually labelled accordingly.[237] Thus, *Midrāš Rabbāʾ* is not a uniform corpus of rabbinic texts. Two of the earliest parts of the ensemble are examined in the present study in connection with the creation of woman.

4.1. *Bərēʾšît Rabbāʾ* – Genesis Rabba

Bərēʾšît Rabbāʾ, meaning "Great Genesis", is a rabbinic *midrāš* anthology providing an extant verse-by-verse exegesis to Genesis.[238] Having a form of a running commentary, it differs from other texts classified as *midrāš rabbāʾ,* the other *midrāšim* being mainly homiletic ones.[239] It presents an interpretative construction through which Genesis has later been read in classical Judaism. The work highlights the religious meaning of the history and salvaging life of Israel. Understandably, the sages seem to have read Genesis as the true history of the world and treated as such in their attempts to interpret it.[240]

Genesis Rabba was composed by Palestinian *āmôrāʾîm* utilizing earlier *aggādôt* from both written and oral sources, some of them dating back until Second Temple Judaism.[241] Based on the language and the rabbis' names mentioned in it, the compilation is dated to the very beginning of the 5th century.[242] Its language, closely resembling that of the Palestinian Talmud with which Genesis Rabba also shares many traditions, is mainly mišnaic Hebrew, although it freely mixes with passages written in Galilean Aramaic. In addition, Greek words are frequent.[243] Ancient tradition ascribed the work to Hošayya Rabba, a Palestinian sage of the first amoraic generation. Later, it has been speculated that he might have had some sort of an initi-

[234] Herr 2007a, 183.
[235] According to H. Mack, the compilation has had many other names over the course of time (1989, 76).
[236] Mack 1989, 70–71.
[237] Mack 1989, 70–71.
[238] Herr & Wald 2007; for a thorough and diverse anthology, see Neusner 2004a.
[239] Freedman 1961, xxvii.
[240] Neusner 2004b, 88, 90; for details concerning the theology of Genesis Rabba, see Neusner 2004c.
[241] Herr & Wald 2007.
[242] Ben-Eliyahu 2012, 81; Herr & Wald 2007; Neusner 2004b, 88.
[243] Ben-Eliyahu 2012, 81; Herr & Wald 2007; for description of the Aramaic portions, see Odeberg 1939

ating role in the process of compilation.[244] It is worth noting that some of the material in Genesis Rabba have been depicted as Babylonian.[245]

Genesis Rabba can be divided into about a hundred sections, *pārāšiyyôt,*[246] depending on the manuscript, covering Genesis almost entirely.[247] The sections are further divided into 5–15 subdivisions which are referred to as chapters below. Each *pārāšâ* deals with one to several biblical verses and begins with an often-anonymous proem. *Pārāšiyyôt* consist of mainly homiletic and ethical interpretations often reflecting relevant topics of the context.[248] At the same time, the smallest units of discourse join for a larger purpose. The coherence of Genesis Rabba, however, has been suggested to derive from the program of the document as a whole rather than from the joining of the smaller units into larger ones.[249]

In Genesis Rabba, the narrative of Genesis is tinctured towards the sacred history of the Jewish people, including a genealogy of Abraham and his descendants. It contains syllogisms with often contradictory statements, pertinent to the verse at hand. The text frequently seems to point to the history and faith of Israel. This might reflect the historical changes in the context of the Roman Empire converting to Christianity and the position of Jews in it.[250]

Perhaps the most important manuscript presenting the text of Genesis Rabba is known as MS Vatican 30, copied in the 10th or the 11th century. The first critical edition in Hebrew was published by J. Theodor and C. Albeck in three volumes during 1912–1936.[251] It has been used as the reference on which the following analyses are based. The sections and the particular chapters reviewed below have been chosen to represent all relevant accounts on the matter of female creation.

Section 8 – Pārāšâ ḥêt

The eighth section of Genesis Rabba is dedicated to Gen. 1:26–28, representing the first account on human creation.

> (26) *And God said, "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness. They shall rule the fish of the sea, the birds of the sky, the cattle, the whole earth, and all the creeping things that creep on earth."*

[244] Freedman 1961, xxviii.
[245] Mack 1989, 78.
[246] Sg. *pārāšâ.*
[247] Ben-Eliyahu 2012, 81; Herr & Wald 2007; Neusner 2004b, 90.
[248] Freedman 1961, xxvii–xxviii.
[249] Neusner 2004b, 91.
[250] Neusner 2004b, 88–89; for a concise description of the historical context relevant to the birth of Genesis Rabba, see Neusner 2004a, 3–12.
[251] Ben-Eliyahu 2012, 81–83.

(27) *And God created man in His image, in the image of God He created him; male and female He created them.*

(28) *God blessed them and God said to them, "Be fertile and increase, fill the earth and master it; and rule the fish of the sea, the birds of the sky, and all the living things that creep on earth."*

The first chapter (8:1) already attempts to harmonize the two creation accounts, a discrepancy constantly bothering the rabbis of Late Antiquity. The first account provided in the second part of Chapter 8:1 is attributed to rabbi Yirmeyahu b. Eleazar (2nd-century *tannāʾ*). It describes God having created the first human as an androgyne, *andrôgînôs.*[252] The rabbi refers to verse Gen. 5:2, a close parallel to Gen. 1:27, stating "male and female He created them; and when they were created, He blessed them and called them *ādām*". Rabbi Samuel b. Naḥmani (3rd-century Palestinian *āmôrāʾ*) further elaborates on the matter so that the Holy One created the first human, *hā-ādām hā-rišôn,* double-faced, *dî-prôsôpôn*,[253] and split him, making two backs.[254] Notably, *hā-ādām* seems to represent a common noun in a definite form as it is followed by an attribute *hā-rišôn*, "the first".

The complementary traditions presented in the previous paragraph seem to understand the creation of man and woman, described in the biblical verse Gen. 1:27 and commented in this section of Genesis Rabba, as simultaneous. However, the setting still alludes to a namely male primal being, *hā-ādām hā-rišôn,* which is also masculine of its grammatical form. It is notable, however, that the idea of the first human being androgynous was already presented by the Greek philosopher Plato (d. 347 BCE) in his *Symposium* (189d–190b),[255] and his thoughts were transmitted into Judaism by Philo, introduced above. It was known also in ancient Near Eastern traditions.[256] As a matter of fact, the rabbis were most likely familiar with Greek wisdom literature, transforming the ideas in a Jewish manner.[257]

For the rabbis, depicting the primal human being as androgynous was a potential hermeneutical tool to adjust the two biblical accounts describing human creation. On the other hand, the older collection of namely halakhic traditions known as the Mišna depicts creation of man "alone" in *Sanhedrîn* 4:5.[258] This seems to have been the majority view in Genesis Rabba as

[252] From Greek ἀνδρόγυνος, meaning "androgyne", *i.e.*, having both sexual organs. In research literature, the word is sometimes translated as "hermaphrodite". The use of this loan word most likely signals the fact that the concept was known mainly from Hellenistic world.
[253] Greek πρόσωπον, meaning "face" or "person".
[254] Theodor 1912, 54–55; for an overview of the concept of the primal androgyne, see Boyarin 1995, 42–46.
[255] Brentlinger & Groden 1970, 61; for a general overview on Plato, see Craig 2005. For Plato's influence on Judaism, see Berman 2007, and for Plato's conception of the origin and nature of humankind, see House 2007.
[256] Baskin 1995, 68; Boyarin 1995, 36; Stemberger 2017, 225–226; Teugels 2000, 109.
[257] Mack 1989, 84–87.
[258] Sefaria.org, Mishnah, Sanhedrin 4:5.

well as later on. In fact, speculations over the concept of an androgynous primal being are present in rabbinic literature, mainly to teach the importance of marriage as a union of the counterparts.[259] Apparently, it would have been too much for the sages to accept the idea of woman being created in divine image.

Next, an unattributed objection is raised referring to Gen. 2:21,[260] mentioning *ṣalʿōtāw* as the substance of which the first person's mate was formed. This element is further specified as "one of his sides", *sṭrwy*,[261] just as "and for the other side wall, *lə-ṣelaʿ,* of the Tabernacle" in Ex. 26:20,[262] translated into Aramaic using the singular form of the word, *sṭr*.[263] This is most likely to indicate that the woman was formed later from the first man, not simultaneously as first suggested by rabbis Yirmeyahu b. Eleazar and Samuel b. Naḥmani above, clearly holding a minority opinion.

In fact, an alternative attempt to harmonize the two creation accounts regarding the creation of human is present in later rabbinic writings according to which the two traditions refer to different female individuals – first one of the women was Lîlît (Lilith) and the second one is known as Ḥawwâ (Eve).[264] The chapter further provides a comment attributed to rabbi Eleazar (b. Šammua, 2nd-century *tannāʾ*) according to which Adam was created as a lifeless mass, *gôlem*, and huge in size.[265] This concept is repeated in Chapter 14:8,[266] as well as 24:2.[267]

Following a heavenly discussion between God and the ministering angels about the forethought of human creation in chapters 8:4–5,[268] the ninth chapter quotes rabbi Simlai (3rd-century Palestinian *āmôrāʾ*) saying that Ādām was created from earth, *ădāmâ.* Eve,[269] however, was created from Ādām, *nivrēʾt Ḥawwâ məʾădām,* but from then on it will be as written in Gen. 1:26: "in our image, after our likeness". He continues stating that there is neither man without a woman, nor a woman without a man, *və-lōʾ išša bəlōʾ îš,* nor the two of them without the presence of God.[270] It has been suggested that the account introduces a model for marriage,

[259] Baskin 1995, 71; Baskin 2002, 62–63; Boyarin 1995, 31–46.
[260] Sefaria.org, Genesis 2:21.
[261] Vowels missing due to the unvocalized Aramaic text.
[262] Sefaria.org, Exodus 26:20.
[263] Theodor 1912, 54–55; the Aramaic word *səṭar* (det. *sîṭrâ*) is translated as "side" in Sokoloff 1990, 373.
[264] For further information on Lilith, see Scholem 2007. Lilith is discussed more lengthily in connection with Alphabet of Ben Sira in Chapter 6.
[265] Theodor 1912, 55–56.
[266] Theodor 1912, 131.
[267] Theodor 1912, 230; the size of Adam in rabbinic literature is discussed in-depth, for example, by G. Stemberger (2017, 224–225) and W. Smelik (2018).
[268] Theodor 1912, 59–62.
[269] The primal woman is named as Eve in many rabbinic accounts commenting on the creation of human, in spite of the fact that in Genesis she is not named until verse 3:20.
[270] Theodor 1912, 63.

presenting a frequent motif probably alluding to the relationship between creation and the life of Israel.[271] This seems to be just about the only instance where the plural form "let us make man" of Gen. 1:26, obviously problematic from a monotheistic perspective, is explained.[272]

Chapter 8:11, commenting upon "male and female, *nəqavâ*, He created them", explains that this biblical verse was one of the things that had changed in a translation for King Ptolemy into "male and his apertures, *nəqûvāyw*, He created them".[273] This tradition indicates that the translators of the Septuagint would have been bothered by the idea of simultaneous creation of both sexes in God's image in such a degree that they would have changed the Scripture itself. However, as this alteration is not present in the Septuagint, it might have reflected the sages' own confusion with the matter.[274] Nevertheless, this account provides a unique alternative explanation to an ambiguous detail in the biblical text: an error!

The next chapter (8:12) comments on Gen. 1:28, not the creation itself. However, it contains an interesting opening to gender relations based on the first creation story. According to the passage, the first part of the verse, "be fertile and increase", is presented in the second person plural whereas the next part, "and master it", could be read as a second person masculine singular. Rabbi Eleazar universalizes this idea into a legal ruling according to which the man, not the woman, is commanded regarding reproduction.[275] As the woman is exempted from the duty of procreation and tending the earth, her individual status seems to get minimized along with this notion.

Although rabbi Yoḥanan b. Baroka (2nd-century *tannāʾ*) seems to object to the interpretation presented above, he explains the biblical expression "and master it", *wə-ḵivšūhā,* so that the object suffix *-hā*, a third person feminine, refers to the first woman – not to the land, *hāʾāreṣ*, feminine in gender, as conventionally understood. Instead, the rabbi's explication is that a man has to subjugate his wife so that she should not go out to the market. This compulsion is further strengthened by a comment that every woman going out to the market will eventually flounder, as happened to Dina,[276] who went out on her own in Gen. 34:1,[277] subsequently getting raped. Here, too, a strong intertextual link is used to confirm a vague connection between

[271] Neusner 1985, 82.
[272] According to Teugels (2000, 110), rabbinic literature seems to understand the plural form of the subject in Gen. 1:26 referring to God and his ministering angels.
[273] Theodor 1912, 64–65.
[274] Baskin 2002, 61.
[275] Theodor 1912, 65–66.
[276] Theodor 1912, 65–66.
[277] Sefaria.org, Genesis 34:1.

the original biblical expression and a long-way-going conclusion. It further consolidates the patriarchal ethos of this rabbinic text.

Section 14 – Pārāšâ yôd dālet

This section offers discussion on Gen. 2:7, presenting the second account on human creation.

> (7) *The LORD God formed man from the dust of the earth. He blew into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living being.*

This verse has conventionally been understood as the creation of man, in particular. However, the second chapter of the section (14:2) already argues somewhat differently. The first account, possibly attributable to rabbi Yose b. Kezarta (unidentifiable) quoted lastly in the previous chapter, suggests that *way-yîṣer*, "and [God] formed" in Gen. 2:7 is written with two *yôds* due to its intention to refer to two acts of creation, one for Ādām and one for Ḥawwâ.[278] The same word, *way-yiṣer*, is spelled with only one *yôd* in Gen. 2:19 referring to the creation of animals.[279] Thus, it seems natural that the sages put some effort to explain this detail.

In the next chapter (14:3), the potential reason for the existence of two *yôds*, is explained as the creation of the beings in both the upper world as well as those in the lower world.[280] The idea of two creations is re-repeated in chapters 14:4, interpreting the two creations as those of good and bad, and in 14:5, referring to the formations of this world and the one in the future.[281] In fact, the same root, *yṣr*, is used in Hebrew and Aramaic for "inclination". This might have been the initiation of the common rabbinic theme concerning the creation of Adam with two inclinations.[282]

In Chapter 14:7, rabbi Yehuda b. Simon (4th-century Palestinian *āmôrāʾ*) proposes that the word for "dust", *ʿāfār,* should be vocalized differently, *ʿôfār,* so that the meaning of the word becomes "a young man". Thus, Adam was created as a fully formed young man. Rabbi Eleazar b. Simeon (2nd-century *tannāʾ*) elaborates on the interpretation stating that Ḥawwâ, too, was created as a fully formed young woman, *məlîʾātâ*. Rabbi Yoḥanan (b. Nafḥa, 3rd-century Palestinian *āmôrāʾ*) further specifies that Ādām and Ḥawwâ were created at the age of twenty years. Dust is male and earth is female, *wa-ădāmâ nəqēvâ,* rabbi Huna (3rd-century Babylonian *āmôrāʾ*) continues.[283] A potter uses dust that is male and earth that is female to make his pots

[278] Theodor 1912, 127.
[279] Sefaria.org, Genesis 2:19.
[280] Theodor 1912, 128.
[281] Theodor 1912, 128–129.
[282] For a thorough review on the two inclinations, especially those of good and bad, see Ulbach 1975, 471–483.
[283] Theodor 1912, 130–131.

strong. The last retort could be understood as a unification of counterparts, but its connection to the previous statements remains puzzling.

Section 17 – Pārāšâ yôd zayin

This section interprets the four verses of Gen. 2:18–21 which is the beginning of the passage considered as the creation of woman.

> (18) *The LORD God said, "It is not good for man to be alone; I will make a fitting helper for him."*
>
> (19) *And the LORD God formed out of the earth all the wild beasts and all the birds of the sky, and brought them to the man to see what he would call them; and whatever the man called each living creature, that would be its name.*
>
> (20) *And the man gave names to all the cattle and to the birds of the sky and to all the wild beasts; but for Adam no fitting helper was found.*
>
> (21) *So the LORD God cast a deep sleep upon the man; and, while he slept, He took one of his ribs and closed up the flesh at that spot.*

The section begins with speculations over the loneliness of the first creature. The second chapter of the section (17:2) presents a statement that anyone who has no wife lives without good, without help, without happiness, without blessing, and without atonement. The account lengthily elaborates on the matter, making numerous intertextual connections, particularly with 1 Sam. 25:6,[284] as well as Eccles. 9:9,[285] encouraging to enjoy life with a woman.[286] The passage is likely to demonstrate that "house" in the Scripture should be understood as "one's wife".[287] It seems to emphasize the importance of marriage through which male and female become one. In fact, this can be seen in the light of simultaneous creation and subsequent separation of the primal being, as if the sides were perfect – like the initial creature – when they reunite. Once again, the rabbis promote marriage as an ultimate perfection of creation.

Explanations for the Hebrew expression *ʿēzer kə-negdô*, "a fitting helper for him" in Gen. 2:18, are discussed in the next chapter (17:3). Whereas the meaning of *ʿēzer* is quite unequivocal, that of the apposition *kə-negdô* is not. This makes it possible to elaborate on the matter. According to this chapter, the wife is a help, *ʿēzer*, if the man is fortunate – otherwise she is against him, *kə-negdô*.[288] This interpretation is lengthily elaborated upon with references to someone's wife.[289] It differs remarkably from the conventional translation of the two Hebrew

[284] Sefaria.org, 1 Samuel 25:6.
[285] Sefaria.org, Ecclesiastes 9:9.
[286] Theodor 1912, 151–152.
[287] Neusner 1985, 180.
[288] Literally "in opposition to him"; for a thorough discussion on the matter in midrašic context, see Teugels 2000, 120–122, and Heger 2014, 14–17.
[289] Theodor 1912, 152–155.

words, "a fitting helper for him", which is, however, still argued upon. Nevertheless, the potential interpretation presented here has not ended up in the modern Bible commentaries,[290] although some other passages from Genesis Rabba are occasionally mentioned.[291]

Actually, the purpose of the creation of woman is discussed later in Chapter 20:11 of Genesis Rabba which, as well as the biblical passage (Gen. 3:20) it comments upon,[292] names the first woman as Ḥawwâ. It specifies the reason for her creation so that she was given to Adam for his vitality, *kə-ḥīyyûtô,* and to serve as his adviser, *û-məyaʿaṣtô.*[293] The first one of the attributes serves as a wordplay based on the first woman's name being a derivative of similar root consonants. The second one, instead, differs from the previous attribution, *ʿēzer kə-negdô,* used in Gen. 2:20. In fact, the passage has been interpreted to allude to the primal woman's role in giving evil counsel and, thus, presenting her in a negative light.[294] Furthermore, the passage suggests an etymological connection between the name Ḥawwâ and the Aramaic word for the "serpent", *ḥiwyāʾ*, definitely having a negative connotation.

Chapter 17:4 explains the creation of animals and the first human naming them in Gen. 2:18–20. Rabbi Aḥa (4th-century Palestinian *āmôrāʾ*) poses a question about why God did not create a partner for this solitary being to begin with. The answer is, as typical for rabbinic discussions, given immediately and explicitly: God foresaw that the man would later complain to God about his wife so he did not create her until Adam himself had asked for her.[295] It seems that even God had no power over the nature of the end product as he simply delays the creation of this baneful figure of the first woman, which can, of course, be explained by the concept of free will. Furthermore, as a contrast to earlier interpretations, particularly to that in Chapter 8:1 opting for simultaneous creation of the primal couple, this chapter clearly understands the creation of genders as consecutive. In addition, it already introduces the problems to be later caused by the first woman at this early stage of the creation narrative.

Chapter 17:6 begins with rabbi Samuel b. Naḥmani specifying that "He took one of his ribs", *way-yiqqaḥ aḥat miṣ-ṣalʿōtāw* means *siṭrôhî,* "sides" in Aramaic, which is in line with the verse Ex. 26:20 mentioning "for the other side wall, *lə-ṣelaʿ,* of the Tabernacle".[296] A simi-

[290] *E.g.*, Arnold 2003, 59–60; Cassuto 1959, 127–129; McKeown 2008, 34; von Rad 1985, 82; Sarna 1989, 21; Speiser 1964, 17; Wenham 1987, 68; Westermann 1990, 227–229.
[291] *E.g.*, Wenham 1987, 68.
[292] Sefaria.org, Genesis 3:20.
[293] Due to the blurriness of the two transcribed words in the printed edition (Theodor 1912, 195), they are given according to the text at Sefaria.org, Bereishit Rabbah 20:11.
[294] Bronner 1994, 25.
[295] Theodor 1912, 155–156.
[296] Theodor 1912, 157.

lar account is also given in Chapter 8:1 in which the rabbi adds that God created the first human double-faced and cut him making backs.[297] These details, however, are not repeated here. Instead, rabbi Samuel continues, switching partly into Aramaic, that the biblical passage commented upon holds a meaning of God removing one rib from between every two, *ʿilʿāʾ ḥādāʾ mi-bên šətê ṣalʿōtāw nāṭal.*[298] The rabbi further points out that the Scripture doesn't mention "under it".[299]

The discussion goes on with rabbi Ḥanina b. Adda (3rd-century Babylonian *āmôrāʾ*) remarkably elaborating the interpretation. He notes that the letter *sāmeḵ, i.e.*, the first letter in the word for Satan, is not used from the beginning of Genesis until this passage and its word *yisgōr,* "closed up" (Gen. 2:21). This indicates, in his opinion, that when the woman was created, Satan was created with her, *kênān šen-nivrēʾt nivrāʾ sāṭān ʿimmāh.*[300] This tradition seems somewhat far-fetched as Satan is usually spelled with *śîn*, not *sāmeḵ* as it is presented here. However, the account clearly juxtaposes the creation of woman with that of a devil, not present anywhere else in rabbinic texts examined in this study.[301] Otherwise, the connection between Eve and Satan is widely speculated in many midrašic contexts.[302]

The next chapter (17:7) reports a matrona, possibly a Roman noble lady who seems to be familiar with the biblical narrative,[303] asking rabbi Yose (b. Ḥalafta, 2nd-century *tannāʾ*) why creating the first woman happened through theft.[304] He replies to her, in a form of a rhetorical question, with a parable: if someone left an ounce of silver to your hands, would you return a litra of silver in public? Obviously, the rabbi compares the greater amount of silver to the creation of woman – losing a body part but gaining a wife, from Ādam's perspective. The lady further wonders why this was done in secret. The rabbi explains that God created her for him to begin with, but he saw her filled with discharge and blood, so God took her away from him and created her for a second time.[305]

---

[297] Theodor 1912, 54–55.
[298] Theodor 1912, 157; *ʿilʿāʾ* (with a variant spelling of *ʾilʿāʾ*) is "the rib" in Aramaic, equivalent to *ha-ṣelaʿ* in Hebrew.
[299] Theodor 1912, 157.
[300] Theodor 1912, 157.
[301] Juxtaposition of the creation of the primal woman and that of a devil is also found in Islamic interpretive tradition in Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī's (d. 1505) exegesis to the Quran (von Schöneman 2018, 47).
[302] Bonner 1994, 26.
[303] *E.g.*, Baskin 2002, 180; Raveh 2014, 146, 177. However, T. Ilan suggests that instead of being a high-class Roman matrona residing in Palestine, Matrona could be the personal name of a Jewish woman involved (Ilan 1994b; Ilan 1997, 240–262, 297–310).
[304] Discussions between rabbi Yose and the matrona constitute a special corpus of traditions in midrašic literature (Ilan 1997, 240–262).
[305] Theodor 1912, 158.

The discussion between the two continues with a practical example of this idea: the matrona mentions that she had been arranged to marry her uncle, but as she had grown up in the same household, she was not appealing in his eyes and he chose another, less beautiful a woman to be his wife.[306] The consensus seems to be that a man's attraction toward a woman requires some distance, introduced as a universal tenet. However, consanguineous unions – including uncle–niece marriage – are, in principle, permissible in Judaism.[307]

Despite being merely a momentary notion, the passage introduced above clearly hints toward a concept of two Eves. At the same time, it serves as harmonization of the two biblical accounts of human creation, those of Gen. 1:26–28 and Gen. 2:18–24, prevalent particularly in early Rabbinic literature as already seen in previous passages of Genesis Rabba. Comparing a part of the creation story to commercial affairs in Chapter 17:7 is also noteworthy – it may reflect an ancient apprehension of women being property of their male relatives.[308] Furthermore, there is a linguistic connection between "depositing", *hafqādâ*, which the Rabbi considers taking the body part to be, and "the moment of conception", *pəqîdâ,* used in rabbinic literature. This could serve as a reflection of a specific symbolic element present in the parable: the man deposits his seed into the woman in secret.[309]

In Chapter 17:8, rabbi Yehošua (b. Ḥanania, 1st–2nd-century *tannāʾ*) is asked why a man comes out his face downwards whereas a woman comes out her face turned upwards, *išŝâ yôṣēʾt pānêhā lə-maʿlâ.* He provides an explication that the man is born looking at the place of his creation, and the woman is born looking at the place of her creation, probably referring to human chest.[310] Although rabbi Yehošua does not mention a rib, the account has been interpreted to refer to it.[311] This somewhat cryptic account most likely refers to the birth of a child, but the assumption regarding the position of the infant's face according to his/her gender is not based on any obstetric facts.

The discussion continues with even more peculiar questions. First, people want an explanation to the fact that a woman has to use perfume whereas a man does not.[312] Rabbi Yehošua explains that the man was born from the earth and the earth never stinks, but Eve was cre-

[306] Theodor 1912, 158.
[307] Bittles 2012, 13–14.
[308] Raveh 2014, 147, 177 (note 6); the authors suggest that this view might be supported by the Mišna, *Qiddûšîn* 1:1, available at Sefaria.org, Mishnah, Kiddushin 1:1.
[309] Raveh 2014, 147.
[310] Theodor 1912, 159.
[311] Baskin 1995, 69.
[312] Theodor 1912, 158–159.

ated from bone, *Ḥawwâ nivrēʾt mē-eṣem*. By comparison, if one leaves meat for three days without salt, it immediately becomes putrid, *masrîʁḥ*. Thus, the message of the rabbi seems to be that women would appear stinky without perfume. Second, the rabbi is asked why a woman's voice travels whereas that of a man does not. He answers with an example of a bowl filled up with meat, the sound of which does not ramble, but if you put a bone inside it, its voice immediately travels.[313] The passage provides two rather misogynous conjectures: women stink and their voices are shrilling by nature.

Next, rabbi Yehošua is asked to specify why it is easy to calm down a man but not a woman. The answer, here again, is based on the different substance of their creation: man was created from the earth and if you pour water onto it, the water dissolves right away. Instead, Eve was created from bone, *Ḥawwâ nivrēʾt mē-eṣem*, and if you soak a bone for a few days in water, it does not dissolve. The chapter goes on with alternating questions and rabbi Yehošua's answers concerning numerous differences between the two genders.[314] All of them strengthen the impression of women's otherness.[315] Furthermore, their dubious characteristics are evident time and again.

Based on the derivative creation of woman and her concomitant subordination, the questions and rabbi Yehošua's replies provide a narrative according to which men make demands upon women and insert sperm into them. Furthermore, a woman does not go out bareheaded because she has done wrong and should be ashamed of people – a notion with long-lasting consequences in Judaism – and women walk in front of the corpse during funerals because they brought death to the world. Furthermore, the concept of menstruation is due to shedding Adam's blood. Even the obligation of lighting the Sabbath candles is derived from her misbehavior at the beginning of times.[316] Here, once again, the creation of woman is already linked to her later fateful disobedience. Yet again, the guilt concerning the "Fall" of humankind is attributed solely to the primal woman.

Section 18 – Pārāšâ yôd ḥêt

This section explores the five verses of Gen. 2:22–25 and Gen. 3:1, the first one which is of particular interest in this study.

[313] Theodor 1912, 159.
[314] Theodor 1912, 159.
[315] For otherness of women in rabbinic literature, see Baskin 2002, 13–43.
[316] Theodor 1912, 159.

(22) *And the LORD God fashioned* [317] *the rib that He had taken from the man into a woman; and He brought her to the man.*

(23) *Then the man said, "This one at last is bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh. This one shall be called Woman, for from man was she taken."*

(24) *Hence a man leaves his father and mother and clings to his wife, so that they become one flesh.*

(25) *The two of them were naked, the man and his wife, yet they felt no shame.*

(1) *Now the serpent was the shrewdest of all the wild beasts that the LORD God had made. He said to the woman, "Did God really say: You shall not eat of any tree of the garden?"*

The section begins with a chapter (18:1) comprising speculations over the verb "build", *way-yiven*, used in Gen. 2:22. Rabbi Eleazar (b. Šammua), in the name of rabbi Yose b. Zimra (2nd–3rd-century *tannāʾ*), claims that woman is endowed with more understanding, *bînâ*, than man.[318] This interpretation might be based on the fact that the word for "understanding" comprises two same consonants, *bêt* and *nûn*, as the verb "build".[319] The rabbi further confirms his statement by quoting the Mišna (*Niddâ* 5:6),[320] which compares girls and boys based on their maturity to take a vow – a girl's vow stands one year younger than that of a boy.[321]

The previous passage, interpretable as a positive one from a female point of view, is immediately overruled by rabbi Yirmeya (4th-century Palestinian *āmôrāʾ*), speaking in the name of Samuel b. Isaac (3rd–4th-century Palestinian *āmôrāʾ*), who reports that there are people opposing to this as a woman is to sit at home, *darkāh šel iššâ lihyôt yôševet bətôḵ bêtāh,* whereas it is the man who goes out to the market and learns human understanding, in particular.[322] It is extremely interesting that the passage seems to overrule a tradition presented in the Mišna. For the first time in the accounts analyzed in this study, an aggadic notion seems to surmount a halakhic ruling. Thus, the domestic role of woman introduced in this passage can be interpreted as a later addition, although it is by no means unprecedented in earlier Jewish writings.

Rabbi Aibu (4th-century Palestinian *āmôrāʾ*), who was told in the name of rabbi Benaya (possibly 2nd-century *tannāʾ*), taught in the name of rabbi Simeon b. Yoḥai (2nd-century *tannāʾ*), adds that God decorated Eve like a bride and brought her to Adam. He reasons this explication based on a notion that people call doing the hair as "building" in some places.[323] It has been suggested that this account should be understood so that the concept of building into a woman

[317] Lit. "built", as detailedly discussed in the introductory chapter of the present study.
[318] Theodor 1912, 160.
[319] Neusner 1985, 189.
[320] Available at Sefaria.org, Mishnah, Niddah 5:6.
[321] Theodor 1912, 160.
[322] Theodor 1912, 160–161.
[323] Theodor 1912, 161.

means fixing one's hair.[324] Rabbi Ḥama b. Ḥanina (3rd-century Palestinian *āmôrāʾ*) further elaborates on the matter, for example, by listing the treasures of Paradise referring to Ezek. 28:13.[325] This passage highlights the general understanding of a woman being ornamental and entertaining for her husband. It further consolidates the otherness of women in the rabbinic discourse of the time.

Almost like a smooth continuum to the previous inference, the next chapter (18:2) provides a discussion on women's indigenous feebleness and other justifications for their subordination. For example, rabbi Yehošua of Sikhnin (4th-century Palestinian *āmôrāʾ*) interprets, in the name of rabbi Levi (3rd-century Palestinian *āmôrāʾ*), that using the verb "build" indicates that God carefully pondered, utilizing a similar verbal stem, from where to created her – there is a linguistic connection with the Hebrew words for "building" and "pondering".[326] God said that he, using first person plural, would neither create her from the head, lest she be supercilious, nor from the eye, lest she be flirtatious, nor from the ear, lest she be an eavesdropper, nor from the mouth, lest she be a gossiper, nor from the heart, lest she be envious, nor from the hand, lest she be a thief, and nor from the leg, lest she be a run-about. "[I will create her] from a modest, *ṣənûʿ*, place of a man so that even when he is standing naked, this spot is covered up, *məḵūssê*", says God.[327]

The account continues in third person masculine singular, interpretable as rabbi Yehošua of Sikhnin reporting that when God created each limb of the woman, he would say to her: [be] a modest woman, *iššâ ṣənûʿâ!*[328] He also quotes a verse from the Proverbs, Prov. 1:25,[329] reprehending people who would not shun God's advice. Next, the account repeats all the body parts mentioned above with examples of dubious characteristics in connection with stories of female figures in the Hebrew Bible,[330] although it would have been possible to find positive examples from among biblical women.[331] The misogynous bias of the account is evident – women are, indeed, opposite to the original divine intentions.[332] This account well mediates the sages'

[324] Neusner 1985, 189.
[325] Theodor 1912, 161–162; *Cf.* Sefaria.org, Ezekiel 28:13; for a detailed examination of the connection between Ez. 28:11–19 and Genesis Rabba 18:1, see Arbel 2005.
[326] Teugels 2000, 124.
[327] Theodor 1912, 162–163.
[328] For closer insight into one of the best-known manifestations of this, covering one's hair, see Bronner 1993.
[329] Sefaria.org, Proverbs 1:25.
[330] Theodor 1912, 163.
[331] Baskin 2002, 54, citing Tirzah Meacham; Bronner 1994, 31–32.
[332] Baskin 1995, 68; Baskin 2002, 53.

understanding of an ideal woman and her inherent characteristics: passivity, humbleness, and modesty.

The next chapter (18:3) continues exegesis based on the verb "build" used in Gen. 2:22. It states that God built more chambers in the woman than in the man, to which the reason is also given: holding a fetus.[333] This seems like a welcomed exception to the rabbinic ethos as it acknowledges women's nurturant characteristics. It also commemorates the women's role as a wife. The importance of marriage is, as seen throughout the study, evident in many other rabbinic accounts, as well. One could, however, read this rabbinic notion in a more gender-sensitive manner, and it could be interpreted to reflect the rabbis' vision according to which the role of woman is considered mainly familial and reproductive.

Chapter 18:4, discussing the passage "then the man said: this one at last is" in Gen. 2:23, reports sayings by rabbi Yehuda b. Rabbi (3rd-century Palestinian *āmôrāʾ*). According to the first account, when God created Eve, Adam saw that she was full of saliva and blood, supposedly getting disgusted, and God separated her from him. Then, God created her for him for the second time, as it is written in Gen. 2:23 referring to the expression "this one at last".[334] The account further speculates on the consonantal connection between "time" and "a bell" not adding, however, to the actual creation of woman. In fact, a similar explication is already given in Genesis Rabba 17:7 where a person asks the reason for why the woman was created while Adam slept – the answer contains an idea of too repugnant a process for Adam to see.[335] Being attractive seems to be presented as one of the main functions of being a woman.

Based on Chapter 18:4, it seems obvious that the first woman was created twice, the first occasion resembling embryogenesis whereas the second contains a more divine tone. It also evokes a question of whether God failed to begin with which, however, is not speculated by the sages. In fact, the concept of two Eves is later referred to in Chapter 22:7 where the rabbis discuss what happened to the first Ḥawwâ. The conclusion seems to be that she had returned to dust. She was, in fact, the reason for the squabble between the first children.[336] This problem can also be seen as a reflection of the lack women in the beginning of humankind. Although this tradition does not mention the name Lilith, it certainly concretizes her potential existence, giving firm roots for the development of Jewish folklore concerning the matter. The culmination of this tradition will be seen later in this study in connection with Alphabet of Ben Sira.

[333] Theodor 1912, 163.
[334] Theodor 1912, 163–164.
[335] Theodor 1912, 158.
[336] Theodor 1912, 213.

Then, rabbi Simeon b. Lakiš (3rd-century Palestinian *āmôrāʾ*) is asked why all dreams do not exhaust the man but this female did, possibly referring to sexual intercourse. The rabbi replied that this is because at the beginning of her creation, she was just a dream, as the Scripture says, "bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh". Rabbi Tanḥuma (b. Abba, 4th-century Palestinian *āmôrāʾ*) connects "bone of my bones" with a man marrying a licit relative.[337] An association with Chapter 17:7 can be seen again, but the impression is somewhat contradictory. This passage seems to emphasize the importance of kinship marriages whereas the discussion in 17:7 brings up the problems in it.[338] Later on, Chapter 18:6 briefly refers to the speedy copulation of the primal couple.[339] In fact, according to Chapter 22:2, the two sons of the couple were born on the very same day.[340] This is only one of the numerous occasions referring to sexual intercourse between the first couple. It seems that the rabbis did not steer clear of this intimate topic.[341]

4.2. *Way-yiqrāʾ Rabbāʾ* – Leviticus Rabba

Way-yiqrāʾ Rabbāʾ, "Great Leviticus", is one of the first extant aggadic *midrāš* compilations.[342] Its redaction has been dated to the mid/late 5th century. Many of the passages are written in Palestinian Aramaic, Hebrew being the most prevalent language.[343] In addition, there are quite a few Greek and Latin words. As the traditions present in Leviticus Rabba seem to reflect the conditions and customs of Palestine during the first centuries CE, the compilation is considered to be of Palestinian origin. Furthermore, the aggadic material is often quoted in the names of Palestinian *tannāʾîm* and *āmôrāʾîm*.[344] A critical edition of the compilation has been published by M. Margulies (1953–60). Perhaps the best extant manuscript, London 340, can be found in the British Library – it is dated before 1000 CE.[345]

Leviticus Rabba seems to draw upon tannaitic texts and it shares many *aggādôt* with and some other rabbinic writings, specifically the Palestinian Talmud.[346] In fact, their literary

[337] Theodor 1912, 164.
[338] *Cf.* Theodor 1912, 158.
[339] Theodor 1912, 168.
[340] Theodor 1912, 205.
[341] See, *e.g.*, Boyarin 1995, 46–57.
[342] Heinemann 2007.
[343] Ben-Eliyahu 2012, 83; Heinemann 2007.
[344] Heinemann 2007.
[345] Ben-Eliyahu 2012, 83–85.
[346] Ben-Eliyahu 2012, 83; Heinemann 2007; Stemberger 1996, 289–290; according to H. Mack, there are about 50 passages which Leviticus Rabba shares with the Yerušalmi (1989, 88).

dependence has been widely discussed.[347] Particularly Genesis Rabba, introduced above, has most likely had a special influence in the transmission process of these traditions.[348] Compared to this slightly earlier *midrāš* collection, Leviticus Rabba does not provide a systematic verse-by-verse commentary on the biblical book it decodes.[349] Instead, it is a homiletical work organized into 37 separate chiasticly-structured sections, *pārāšiyyôt*, based on the different themes of the homilies regarding Leviticus.[350] Some of the material, perhaps even a majority of it, has probably been gained from sermons held in local synagogues.[351] The homilies, however, seem to be mainly literary constructions.[352] Each begins with an often anonymous opening, *pətîḥâ*,[353] followed by the sermon proper.[354]

The compilation of Leviticus Rabba has been suggested to serve as Hellenistic provincial literature and an encyclopedic collection. As it puts a lot of effort to emphasizing the study of the Tora, it was probably used for teaching purposes.[355] It also addresses women in some of its passages. Some of the texts seem to be nearly free of misogyny, but there are quite a few accounts reflecting obvious disdain regarding women. In addition, it has been proposed to convey an ambivalent attitude towards humanity as a whole.[356] Nevertheless, the overall message of Leviticus Rabba seems to be, as frequently in all rabbinic literature, the importance of sanctification and salvation of Israel.[357]

Section 14 – Pārāšâ yôd dālet

The beginning of the fourteenth section provides a conversation of interest in this study. In the first chapter (14:1), consisting of interpretations on Leviticus 12:2,[358] the passage "if a woman conceives" is interpreted referring to Psalm 139:5, "You hedge me before and behind, *āḥôr vāqedem ṣartānî,* and You lay Your hand upon me". This interpretation actually contains a linguistic problem in connection with any association to the creation: the rabbis seem to understand

[347] For a short introduction to different stances, see Stemberger 1996, 290.
[348] Ben-Eliyahu 2012, 83; Langer 2016, 345, 352.
[349] Heinemann 2007.
[350] Ben-Eliyahu 2012, 83; Heinemann 2007; Langer 2016, 350; for an example of this chiastic structure, see Langer 2016, 355.
[351] Heinemann 2007.
[352] Stemberger 1996, 289.
[353] Pl. *pətîḥôt*; there are a total of 126 *pətîḥôt* in the compilation, most of them based on the third part, *Kətûvîn*, of the Hebrew Bible, (Mack 1989, 89).
[354] Stemberger 1996, 289.
[355] Langer 2016, 352.
[356] Visotzky 2003, 99–120.
[357] Neusner 2004d, 411, 416.
[358] Sefaria.org, Leviticus 12:2.

the word *ṣartānî* to be derived from *yṣr,* just like the verb for "forming" or "creating", and not from *ṣyr* translated as "surround" or "hedge". Based on this verse, however, rabbi Yoḥanan (b. Nafḥa) brings forth that if a man succeeds, he inherits two worlds, this one and the one to come – and if he does not, as it is written in Job 13:21,[359] he gives reckoning.[360]

Rabbi Samuel b. Naḥmani continues annotating that when God created the first human, he created him as an androgynous being, some sort of a formless lump. A similar account is also found in Genesis Rabba 8:1, although attributed to rabbi Yirmeyahu b. Eleazar.[361] Another sage extends the tradition proposing that the first being was created dual-faced, *dw prṣwfyn,*[362] using a linguistic formulation later found in the Bavli (*Bərāḵôt 61a*) – in addition, a similar account is also given in Genesis Rabba 8:1 although using the Greek-derived term of *prôsôpôn,* holding an equivalent meaning.[363]

The tradition further suggests that this original being with two body-fronts was cut and two were made: one was male and one female, just like what was attributed to rabbi Samuel b. Naḥmani in Genesis Rabba 8:1.[364] Here, too, the sage is challenged referring to Gen. 2:21 and the word *ṣelaʿ* from which the woman is built, but this objection is rejected explaining that it means "of his sides", *mi-siṭrôhî,* in Aramaic, similar to the meaning of *ṣelaʿ* in Ex. 26:20. The discussion goes on between three rabbis who interpret that God created the first man to fill the entire world, from one end of the world to the other.[365] They further speculate over the matter, however, not bringing new elements to the narrative of female creation.

[359] Sefaria.org, Job 13:21.
[360] Sefaria.org, Vayikra Rabbah 14:1.
[361] *Cf.* Theodor 1912, 54–55.
[362] Exact vowels are not known; Sefaria.org, Vayikra Rabbah 14:1.
[363] *Cf.* Theodor 1912, 55.
[364] *Cf.* Theodor 1912, 55.
[365] Sefaria.org, Vayikra Rabbah 14:1.

5. Amoraic Reinforcement of Interpretive Tradition – *Talmûd Bāvlî*

Talmûd Bāvlî, often – as in the present study – referred to simply as the Talmud or the Bavli, is a monumental collection of both halakhic and aggadic traditions.[366] It consists of several thousands of folio leaves (standard-edition pages),[367] providing an encyclopedic compilation of all relevant-considered traditions on each matter under discussion.[368] The work, organized according to six mišnaic orders, *sədārîm,* is traditionally understood as a commentary to the Mišna.[369] Although the Talmud offers interpretation to only a little bit more than half of the 63 mišnaic tractates,[370] it is considered to be a systematic exegesis to the Mišna, as well as an amplification of its laws.[371] The word *talmûd* is not actually used in itself, and it does not ascribe the work to any named authority. However, the editorial framework in which earlier traditions and discussions are presented is evident.[372]

A great part of the Talmud is formed of dialectical chains of arguments, *sûgyôt,*[373] which bring up numerous tannaitic and amoraic sources. They use mišnaic passages as a starting point and proceed with often Babylonian-Aramaic *gəmārāʾ* – deriving from an Aramaic word for "studying" – which contains additional exegetic material from various rabbinic sources. This interpretative material can be divided into *bāraytôt, – i.e.,* tannaitic traditions not included in the Mišna – and teachings of the *āmôrāʾîm.*[374] The Talmud in its entirety seems to be heterogenous using mismatched sources, authors, redactors, and schools, and assembling different layers of time periods and generations.[375]

The language of the Bavli is highly discursive. However, *sûgyôt* most likely represent idealized reconstructions of potential discussions among the *āmôrāʾîm* in rabbinic academies.[376] *Sûgyôt* were passed through generations and study circles, and augmented with comments and glosses along this process.[377] Mainly post-amoraic anonymous editorial voice by the

[366] Wald 2007b, 470.
[367] Stemberger 1996, 191; Wald 2007b, 470; the leaves are numbered consecutively so that the sides of each numbered leaf represent "a" and "b" parts of it, for example, *Bərāḵôt 61a* is the 121st page of the tractate *Bərāḵôt* (*e.g.,* Ben-Eliyahu 2012, 35).
[368] Stemberger 1996, 192.
[369] Wald 2007b, 470.
[370] Stemberger 1996, 191.
[371] Neusner 2002, 143.
[372] Jacobs 1991, 4.
[373] Sg. *sûgyâ*, deriving from "to go, course" (Aramaic).
[374] Wald 2007b, 470–471.
[375] Stemberger 1996, 194–195; this is J. N. Epstein's view in opposition to J. Neusner's depiction of the matter.
[376] Wald 2007b, 470–471.
[377] Schiffman 2003, 361.

stammāʾîm can be identified throughout the Talmud.[378] This part of the compilation is a multi-layered outcome of actions by numerous generations of redactors.[379] Both the *āmôrāʾîm* and the subsequent redactors attempted to integrate law and Scripture in order to strengthen the position of oral Tora as a representation of divine revelation. The talmudic passages first originated as oral discussions and analyses taking place in amoraic academies.[380]

The amoraic content of the Talmud consists of direct statements and formal questions by the rabbis, stories reporting their actions, and brief debates between the sages of the time.[381] The discussions typically cite a passage that contradicts the original passage under discussion, then explaining the difference between them. Their origin is, in fact, in the habit of resolving contradictions within the tannaitic traditions.[382] In addition, Bavli is rich in *midrāš* utilizing material attributed to both tannaitic and amoraic sources.[383] Most of its *aggādâ* seems to be of Palestinian origin, the aggadic contribution in the Talmud consisting of extensive modification of earlier Palestinian themes. Creative and synthetic editorial techniques have been used to compose coherent narratives of matters barely attested in earlier sources.[384] This feature is specifically utilized in the present study, as can be read already in the subheading of this chapter.

The first mentions of the Babylonian Talmud date back to the time right after the Islamic conquest of the areas with significant Jewish communities from 634 CE onwards. A traditional medieval view attributes the redaction of it to two influential amoraic sages, Ravina I and Rav Aši, who died in the 420's. As a matter of fact, their generation might have had an important role in collecting and editing the main material still present in Bavli. However, the process of redaction most likely extended into the sixth century.[385] The only nearly-complete extant manuscript of the Talmud is known as Munich Codex Hebraicus 95, dating back to the 14th century. The first printed edition was published in 1523 in Italy, but the most commonly reproduced one was published much later, during the 1880's, in Vilna.[386] Dr. Epstein's translation, printed dur-

[378] Wald 2007b, 470; for a thorough introduction to the role of *stammāʾîm,* see Rubenstein 2005. The redactors have sometimes been called *sāvôrāʾîm* as introduced in the introductory section of the present study. Rubenstein considers *stammāʾîm* as the main editors and redactors of the Talmud.
[379] Wald 2007b, 471.
[380] Schiffman 2003, 360–361.
[381] Wald 2007b, 471.
[382] Schiffman 2003, 360.
[383] Stemberger 1996, 199.
[384] Wald 2007b, 478–479.
[385] Schiffman 2003, 362–368.
[386] Ben-Eliyahu 2012, 35–37.

ing 1935–52, is the best known English translation.[387] It also contains introductions to the talmudic orders and tractates, utilized as a part of the following analyses.

Bavli has served as an inspiration for religious discussions and study circles for hundreds of years. It was thoroughly commented by subsequent Jewish scholars, and some interpretations have been copied ever since as an almost canonic part of the original work. [388] Those of rabbi Salomon b. Isaac (d. 1105), better known by his acronym "Raši",[389] and *Tôsāfôt* (lit. "supplements") by his disciples are still printed beside the talmudic text in modern editions.[390] The Talmud was already consolidated as an authoritative and canonic part of majority Judaism during medieval times. Its effective history is unparalleled, although the sages producing this literary tradition most likely couldn't anticipate such trajectory.[391]

5.1. *Sēder Zərāʿîm* – Agricultural Laws

Sēder Zərāʿîm, "Order of Seeds", is the first one of the six mišnaic orders to be commented in the huge talmudic collection of traditions. It mainly deals with agricultural laws of the Tora. Each one of the eleven tractates included in this order addresses an individual aspect of its general subject, the first one being *Bərāḵôt*, "Benedictions", which covers matters relating to prayer and worship.[392] It is loaded with *aggādôt*, comprising a total of nine chapters, the last one of which delivers benedictions for various special occasions.[393] It also contains a *sûgyâ* dealing with the creation of woman.

Bərāḵôt 61a

The *sûgyâ* concerning the creation of human begins with rav Naḥman b. Ḥisda (4th-century Babylonian *āmôrāʾ*) posing a question about the meaning of the double *yôds* in the Hebrew word for "formed", *way-yîṣer* (Gen. 2:7). He claims that the two *yôds* indicate that God created two inclinations: a good one and an evil one. Rav Naḥman b. Isaac (4th-century Babylonian *āmôrāʾ*) objects to this since animals – with respect to whom *way-yiṣer* is not written with a double *yôd* – would not have the other inclination and, yet, we see that they cause damage, bite and kick. He suggests that the two *yôds* should rather be interpreted in accordance with the

[387] Ben-Eliyahu 2012, 35.
[388] Wald 2007b, 477–480.
[389] For further information on Raši, see Rothkoff *et al.* 2007.
[390] Goldenberger 1984, 139; for technical details concerning the layout of the Talmud, see the entire article.
[391] Fishman 2011, 1–19.
[392] Epstein 1958, xiii.
[393] Simon 1958, xxvii.

opinion of rabbi Simeon b. Pazzi (3rd-century Palestinian *āmôrāʾ*) according to whom this relates to the difficulty of human life. The theme of Adam's inclinations in connection with the double *yôds* present in the biblical verse was already introduced in Genesis Rabba 14,[394] but this passage does not take hold in the matter any further.

Rabbi Yirmeya b. Eleazar gives an alternative view: God created two faces, *dw prṣwfyn*,[395] on the first man, just like it is written in Psalm 139:5 indicating that a person has been formed, *ṣartānî,* from behind and before. This account is very similar to that in Chapter 8:1 of Genesis Rabba,[396] attributed to rabbi Samuel b. Naḥmani, as well as the one in Leviticus Rabba 14:1.[397] In fact, the idea of simultaneous creation of the primal beings, man and woman, is also discussed in two other parts of the Bavli, in *ʿĒrûvîn 18a* and *Kətûvôt 8a*.

Although the previous tradition seems to present a concept of an androgynous primal being, it is immediately followed by opposing stances. Some rabbis disagree over the meaning of the word *ṣēlaʿ* mentioned in Gen. 2:22 – the other one says that it means face, *parṣûf,* indicating that Ḥawwâ was originally one face of Ādām, whereas the other rabbi interprets it as a tail, *zānāv.*[398] The tail mentioned in this explication, denoting that the first woman was rather a protuberance, is a unique theme which is not adduced later in rabbinic accounts on the creation of human. It certainly encases a disparaging connotation, probably reflecting deeply rooted rabbinic attitudes toward the secondary gender, women.

The *gəmārāʾ* further analyzes the foregoing dispute proposing that *ṣēlaʿ* means, indeed, face – this can be concluded based on Psalm 139:5, already quoted above. This, in turn, could be understood so that God simply built the female face of the primal human being into an autonomous woman.[399] Based on the opinion of rav Ammi (b. Nathan, 3rd-century Palestinian *āmôrāʾ*), however, the verse can also be explained in accordance with the other interpretation, "tail", so that "behind" means [Adam as] the last one in the act of creation, and "before" refers to the first as for punishment. This rather cryptic rendition digresses in a thicket of intertextuality speculating that Adam was "behind", meaning the last in the creation so that he was not created until the eve of the sixth day, *šabbāt.* The word "before", first for punishment, is elaborated upon more lengthily, also referring to the serpent episode in the Garden of Eden and utilizing both Lev. 10:12 and Gen. 7:23.[400] The *gəmārāʾ* then returns to the interpretation of *way-yîṣer*

[394] *Cf.* Theodor 1912, 128–129.
[395] Vowels missing due to the talmudic text.
[396] *Cf.* Theodor 1912, 54–55.
[397] *Cf.* Sefaria.org, Vayikra Rabbah 14:1.
[398] Hebrew, not found in Aramaic dictionaries.
[399] Baskin 2002, 48.
[400] Sefaria.org, Leviticus 10:12*;* Sefaria.org, Genesis 7:23.

and the two *yôds*, alluding to the two formations and, thus, confirming the idea of Eve having been a face, *parṣûf*, of Adam.

The speculation goes on analyzing the interpretation of Ḥawwâ having been either a face or a tale. This is done in connection with Gen. 5:2 containing "male and female He created them", the object of the sentence being in plural, "them", unlike in Gen. 1:27. The *gəmārāʾ* brings up an opinion by rabbi Abbahu (3rd–4th-century Palestinian *āmôrāʾ*) who had previously noted a contradiction between the verses of Gen. 5:2 and Gen. 9:6, the latter one stating "for in His image did God make man, *hā-ādām*" – notably, using a singular form. His explanation is also given: at first, it was God's intention to create two, but at the end only one was created. The interpretation is further tested in connection with Gen. 2:21 announcing that God "closed up the flesh at that spot" to which the meaning of a "tail" would be difficult to adjust. To this, rabbi Yirmeya or rav Zevid (4th-century Babylonian *āmôrāʾ*), or rav Naḥman b. Isaac, has earlier said that the word would only be applicable to the place of the incision.

The previous evidence for "face" is challenged by referring to Gen. 2:22 and "God fashioned [built] the rib, *ṣēlaʿ*, that He had taken from the man into a woman" in it. The *gəmārāʾ* suggests that the word *way-yiven*, "and he built", should be interpreted as previously suggested by rabbi Simeon b. Menasya (2nd–3rd-century *tannāʾ*), according to whom the verse teaches that God plaited Eve's hair and brought her to Adam. This idea is based on the fact that braiding hair, *qəlîʿatāʾ*, is called "building" in coastal cities. A similar tradition was presented in the name of rabbi Aibu already in Genesis Rabba 18:1.[401] Here, however, no precarious conclusions are drawn right away. Instead, an explication by rav Ḥisda (3rd–4th-century Palestinian *āmôrāʾ*) provides an alternative, possibly also taught in a *bārāytāʾ*: "building" could be understood as a description of her basic shape, indicating that Eve was built like the structure of a storehouse, *kə-binyān*, yielded from the consonantal root of *bny*.[402] Just like a storehouse, built narrow on top and wide on bottom, a woman is created narrow on top and wide on the bottom, in order to hold the fetus. This could have been meant as a courtesy indicating that motherhood is the ultimate goal of female life.[403] However, it strongly emphasizes the physical disparity of women.

Lastly, the *gəmārāʾ* poses a question about which one of the two faces discussed above went ahead. Rav Naḥman b. Isaac answers that it is reasonable for the man to have gone ahead, as it has been taught: a man should not walk behind a woman on a road, and even if his wife

[401] *Cf.* Theodor 1912, 161.
[402] The consonants have previously been discussed in connection with "understanding" in Genesis Rabba 18:1 (Theodor 1912, 160–161).
[403] Bronner 1994, 29.

happens to be in front of him on a bridge, he should move her to his side. Furthermore, anyone who crosses a river behind a woman has no portion in the World-to-Come. The rabbinic discussion continues with several misogynous statements, also extending to the next folio, however, not referring to human creation anymore. Despite the lingering discussion, no final resolution to the concept of *ṣēlaʿ* representing either face or tail, nor to rabbi Abbahu's effort to explain the controversy between Gen. 5:2 and Gen. 9:6, is given. This is, indeed, distinctive of talmudic deliberations. Nevertheless, the part of which the primal woman was created from seems to have become just a small part of Adam, not half.

5.2. *Sēder Môʿēd* – Holy Occasions & Festivals

Sēder Môʿēd, usually understood as the second order of the Talmud, addresses the feasts, fasts and other religious events typical for the Jewish calendar.[404] It comprises eleven tractates, three of which briefly discuss the creation of women.

Šabbāt 95a

The first of the tractates in *Sēder Môʿēd* is *Šabbāt* which thoroughly deals, in accordance with its name, with different matters regarding the Sabbath,[405] the seventh day of the Jewish week and dedicated for rest. A part of the tractate, *Šabbāt 95a*, makes a minor excursion, although a reinforcing one regarding previous traditions, into the creation of woman.

When the rabbis discuss female make-up practices, making an association to "building", the *gəmārāʾ* reports rabbi Simeon b. Menasya's interpretation: building can be understood as plaiting, in accordance with the colloquial language of people in the islands of the sea, in connection with the verse of Gen. 2:22. A similar association was earlier made in Genesis Rabba 18:1 presenting a tradition attributed to rabbi Simeon b. Yoḥai according to whom God decorated Eve like a bride and brought her to Adam – this was reasoned by the fact that in some places, people consider doing the hair as "building".[406] Similarly, *Bərāḵôt 61a* refers to a corresponding linkage, although identifying the place where people use this word as "coastal cities". After this short digression into Gen. 2, the *sûgyâ* strictly concentrates on make-up practices on Sabbath.

[404] Epstein 1938a, xxi.
[405] Epstein 1938a, xxi–xxii.
[406] *Cf.* Theodor 1912, 160–161.

ʿĒrûvîn 18a–b

The second tractate of this order, *ʿĒrûvîn,*[407] extends the first one as it also deals with Sabbath laws.[408] It has ten chapters, the second one of which contains a discussion on the origin of Eve, very similar to that already presented in *Bərāḵôt 61a*. The conversation of the rabbis brings up the word *diyô* comprising a meaning of "double", obviously derived from Greek δύο, "two". First, rabbi Yirmeya b. Eleazar's tradition is given: Adam was created with two faces, *diyô parṣûf,* a male and a female one. Similarly to *Bərāḵôt 61a*, the passage continues with a reference to Psalms 139:5 "You hedge me, *ṣartānî,* before and behind", comparing it with Gen. 2:22 which mentions the word of special interest in this study, *ṣēlaʿ*. Notably, this account is very similar to those of Genesis Rabba 8:1 and Leviticus Rabba 14:1.

Rabbi Yirmeyahu b. Eleazar disagrees with Samuel (of Nehardea, 2nd–3rd-century Palestinian *āmôrāʾ*) over the meaning of the word *ṣēlaʿ* – one said "face" whereas the other one said "tail". The *gəmārāʾ* finds the rendition of a "face" consistent with the psalm. However, it also states that this verse could be understood as a moral message, in accordance with the opinion of rabbi Ammi (b. Nathan) who had interpreted "behind" meaning the last one in the act of creation and "before" referring to the first as for punishment. This account is identical to that already presented in *Bərāḵôt 61a*. Correspondingly, the *gəmārāʾ* speculates that Adam was "behind", thus, he was not created until the eve of *šabbāt*. The word "before" is interpreted to refer to the sin regarding the tree-of-knowledge episode told in Gen. 3. Finally, the *gəmārāʾ* links the punishment to the Flood described in Gen. 7:23.[409]

The *gəmārāʾ* then proceeds with the interpretation of *way-yîṣer* and its two *yôds*, found in Gen. 2:7, probably interpretable as one for Ādām and one for Ḥawwâ. This is connected with "face" as the original substance of separation, discussed above. Similarly to *Bərāḵôt 61a*, a comparison is made with "tail" – rabbi Simeon b. Pazzi utilizes different forms derived from the consonant root *yṣr*, used for words "inclination" and "Maker". A commensurate account was also given in *Bərāḵôt 61a*, and the idea of the two *yôds* representing two acts of creation, one for Adam and one for Eve, has already been presented in Genesis Rabba 14:2–5.[410]

Next, the *gəmārāʾ* proceeds to connect the idea of two faces with Gen. 5:2, "male and female He created them". It brings up an opinion by rabbi Abbahu, according to whom it was God's intention to create two, but he ended up creating only one. This setting is examined in

[407] Eng. "Mixtures".
[408] Slotki 1938, xi.
[409] Sefaria.org, Genesis 7:23.
[410] *Cf.* Theodor 1912, 127–129.

connection with Gen. 2:21 to which the meaning of a "tail" would allegedly not suit. Here, and for several paragraphs from here on, the text follows tightly that of *Bərāḵôt 61a*. In fact, it is identical for the entire account given in this paragraph, thus, the rest is eliminated from here to avoid unnecessary repetition.

The folio (18a) ends in the middle of a sentence reporting rav Ḥisda's interpretation that building could be understood as a description of Eve's basic shape, indicating that she was built like the structure of a storehouse. The next folio, *ʿĒrûvîn 18b*, continues the same account mentioning a storehouse being built wide on the bottom and narrow on top, just like a woman. Furthermore, it presents the previously mentioned tradition, attributed to rabbi Naḥman b. Isaac, according to which a woman should not walk before a man lest he has no share in the hereafter. The rabbis seem to assume that a woman walking in front of a man would necessarily cause licentious thoughts. As a matter of fact, this can be interpreted to contest the doings of men, in particular.

Məgillâ 9a

Məgillâ is the tenth tractate of *Sēder Môʿēd*. According to its name, this tractate mainly deals with the Book of Esther, especially its position in Jewish liturgy.[411] The first chapter, particularly the folios from 7a to 10b, presents a series of *mišnāyôt* with short discussions in the *gəmārāʾ*.[412] One of the mišnaic passages, present at the end of folio 8b, deals with the difference between Tora scrolls, phylacteries and *məzûzôt*.[413] The *gəmārāʾ* then discusses the use of different languages ending up with the translation process of the Septuagint. Reportedly, all the 72 translators came up with the same translation of certain parts of Genesis, also including identical modifications. For example, they wrote that God created *him*, not *them*, male and female.

This report concerning Gen. 1:27 points to a remarkable deviation from the biblical text. Interestingly, this is the second time in this study that an error has been suggested to explain an ambiguous detail in the Scripture. A similar one, even in connection with the same verse, was previously presented in Genesis Rabba 8:11, explaining that this biblical verse was one of the things that had changed in their translation for King Ptolemy.[414] Instead of finding exegetic solutions to the discrepancy within the verse, the sages seem to skip the matter by referring to an

[411] Simon 1938, xi.
[412] Sg. *mišnâ, i.e.*, a mišnaic passage.
[413] A *məzûzâ* is a piece of parchment in a decorative case and inscribed with specific Hebrew verses from the Tora. They are often placed on the doorposts of Jewish homes.
[414] *Cf.* Theodor 1912, 64–65.

intentional edit to the original text. Nevertheless, they attempt to affirm that the first being was only one – and male.

5.3. *Sēder Nāšîm* – Women & Marriage Law

One of the best known talmudic orders is that of women, *Sēder Nāšîm*, self-explanatorily addressing issues related to women. It concentrates mainly on marital and family life. The rabbis' attitudes towards marriage was profusely positive which is brought up in numerous occasions within this order.[415] *Sēder Nāšîm* consists of seven tractates two of which, *Yəvāmôt* and *Kətubbôt*, also add to the discourse on the creation of woman.

Yəvāmôt 62b–63a, 65b, 103b

The first tractate of *Sēder Nāšîm* is called *Yəvāmôt*, "Sisters-in-Law". It deals with both levirate and prohibited marriages as well as *ḥălîṣâ*, a ceremony performed to avoid levirate coupling.[416] In *Yəvāmôt 62b*, belonging to the sixth chapter of the sixteen ones in the tractate, the *gəmārāʾ* discusses marriage in general, first reporting rabbi Tanḥum's (3rd-century Palestinian *āmôrāʾ*) tradition originally heard from his father, rabbi Ḥanilai. According to this account, a man who does not have a wife is without joy (in contrary to Deut. 14:26), without blessing (in contrary to Ez. 44:30) and without goodness (as in contrary to Genesis 2:18).[417] Thus, this passage shortly discusses the purpose of female creation. It further suggests that a man should love his wife as himself which has been understood to refer to the creation story, the wife being created from the man.[418]

The next folio, *Yəvāmôt 63a*, also briefly refers to the creation. It presents rabbi Eleazar (b. Šammua) saying that a man who does not have a wife is not a man, referring to Gen. 5:2 "male and female He created them; and when they were created, He blessed them and called them *ādām*". Similarly, according to rabbi Eleazar here referring to Psalms 115:16,[419] a man who does not have his own land is not a man. This account can be interpreted to parallelize owning a wife to that of land. Once again, the *gəmārāʾ* utilizes intertextual linkage to justify the agenda of the sages. Yet this departure from the general theme provides a forum for novel discussions concerning human creation, particularly that of the first woman.

---

[415] Epstein 1936a, xxvii–xxx.
[416] Epstein 1936a, xxviii.
[417] *Cf.* Sefaria.org, Deuteronomy 14:26; Sefaria.org, Ezekiel 44:30; Sefaria.org, Genesis 2:18.
[418] Bronner 1994, 29.
[419] Sefaria.org, Psalms 115:16.

Next, rabbi Eleazar speculates over the meaning of "I will make *ʿēzer kə-negdô*..." in Gen. 2:18, translatable as "a fitting helper for him". The famous sage interprets that if a man is fortunate, *zāḵâ*, his wife helps him, but if he is not fortunate, she is against him – the expression *kə-negdô* can be understood both as "meet for him" and "against him". Until this, the tradition seems similar to the one presented in Genesis Rabba 17:3.[420] Here, however, the rabbi also raises a contradiction based on the biblical text, as the root of *ngd* can also comprise a meaning of "lashing him" if vocalized differently,[421] which is a fairly common hermeneutic procedure in rabbinic literature.[422] Thus, if he is fortunate she is meet for him, but if he is not fortunate she lashes him. This is an interesting elaboration on the purpose of the creation of women – it could be understood so that the creation of woman was not *per se* a positive event.

The *gəmārāʾ* describes a meeting between rabbi Yose (b. Ḥalafta) and the prophet Eliyahu,[423] the former proposing a question about the way in which a woman is a helper for a man. He continues with several rhetorical questions enlightening the matter. Rabbi Eleazar (b. Šammua) responds referring to Gen. 2:23, containing "This one at last is bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh". He suggests that the passage encompasses a meaning of Adam first having had intercourse with each animal and beast, but his mind was not at ease until he did it with Eve. This is in accordance with Gen. 2:20, "but for Adam no fitting helper was found".

The idea of the primal man having sex with the animals is startling, and the previous passage is, indeed, still argued upon. Although it underlays the importance of wife, it also depicts the man as a sexual being and the role of the wife, in turn, solely as an object of his carnal desire. Furthermore, in *Yəvāmôt 65b*, one of the rabbis interprets the command "Be fertile and increase, fill the earth and master it" in Gen. 1:28 so that is the nature of a man to subdue and it is not the nature of a woman to subdue – thus, as he suggests, it is obvious that the *miṣwâ*,[424] commandment, is given only to men. It seems that men are obliged to the underlying sexual performance, and Eve is only later infused with lust by copulation with the snake, as described in *Yəvāmôt 103b*.

[420] *Cf.* Theodor 1912, 152–155.
[421] The meaning of *paʿʿel* from *ngd* is "to lash someone" in Talmudic Aramaic (Sokoloff 2002, 728).
[422] Teugels 2000, 121.
[423] According to Teugels (2000, 121), encounters between the Prophet and sages are frequent in rabbinic literature.
[424] Pl. *miṣwôt.*

Kətubbôt 8a

The second tractate of *Sēder Nāšîm* is entitled *Kətubbôt*, "Marriage contracts",[425] which it also thoroughly discusses.[426] It addresses the laws regarding different aspects of marriage, including the duties and privileges of both the husband and the wife. The first chapter begins with a description of the institution of marriage, specifying many details concerning the matter.[427] The eighth folio proceeds with a discussion on the appropriate number of blessings to be recited during a wedding. These benedictions frequently refer to the creation, the third one of them mentioning the making of humanity in God's image and preparing a perpetual building, *binyān,* out of the man, possibly serving as a wordplay based on the verb "build" mentioned in Gen. 2:22 and promoting the nature of female creation for propagation purposes.[428] This has also been interpreted so that in creating Eve out of man, God provided an eternal renewal of the human being.[429] Comparing the creation of woman to building a storehouse has already been mentioned in both *Bərāḵôt 61a* and *ʿĒrûvîn 18a,* comprising identical text in connection with the verb "build" in Gen. 2:22.

Next, the *gəmārāʾ* presents a lengthier discussion, once again harmonizing the creation stories and the potential discrepancy between Gen. 1:27 and the later account containing the creation of woman. One of the sages purports that there was one act of creation by which man was created. However, another sage holds that there were two formations: one during which man and woman were originally created in one entity and a second one during which a female was separated from the male. This dispute relates to the number of blessings listed at the beginning of the folio. The *gəmārāʾ* then rejects the latter view arguing that everyone agrees it was only one act of creation. Here, once again, the conflicting creation accounts are settled by a conclusion that the original human being was male and the female being was only later created out of his body. Thus, only the man was created in God's likeness.

Rav Yehuda (b. Ilai, 2nd-century *tannāʾ*) explains the matter discussed above as follows: it is written "And God created man in His image" (Gen. 1:27), easily interpreted indicating one act of creation, and it is written "male and female He created them" (Gen. 5:2), possibly indicating two acts. He continues resolving the contradiction so that initially there was a thought to

[425] Technically, the word refers to anything that is written, and it can also be used for the amount due to the wife in case of husband's death or abandonment by him (Slotki 1936, xi).
[426] Slotki 1936, xi.
[427] Slotki 1936, xi.
[428] Anderson 1992, 59.
[429] Epstein 1936b, 31.

create two, but in the end only one was created. This account is similar to a tradition, attributed to rabbi Abbahu who tried to settle between Gen. 5:2 and Gen. 9:6, introduced in *Bərāḵôt 61a* and *ʿĒrûvîn 18a*. The passage has been suggested to propose that only when a male and female are together, they represent the true *ādām* – once again, this can be interpreted as zealous advocacy for marriage.[430]

The text seems to support the impression, already gained from Genesis Rabba 8, that the predominant interpretation among the rabbis opted for a solitary man who was created in God's image. This notion might have had an important role in primacy and privileging the men. In fact, the possibility of simultaneous creation of two separate entities is not addressed in rabbinic literature at all, probably reflecting the sages' fear for disturbance in their sexual politics.[431] This is likely to have sustained the asymmetry of genders.

5.4. *Sēder Nəzîqîn* – Damages & Civil Law

Sēder Nəzîqîn, "Order of Damages", is the fourth of the six orders present in the Talmud. *Nəzîqîn* mainly addresses legally arbitrate damages and financial matters. Of its eight tractates, only *Sanhedrîn*, the fourth of them, discusses the creation of woman. In addition, the third tractate *Bāvāʾ Batrāʾ*, "Last Gate", pronounces in its folio 58a that compared to Adam, Eve is like a monkey compared to a human. However, she is still more beautiful than any other woman. Once again, the woman is appreciated solely for her entertaining potential.

Sanhedrîn 38a–39b, 107a

The Greek-derived name of the tractate, *Sanhedrîn*, refers to higher courts of law during the Second Temple period. Accordingly, the tractate comprising a total of 11 chapters discusses different aspects of criminal law.[432] As characteristic of the Bavli, the discussions meander and often end up deliberating far-reaching network of topics. This is the case also in connection with a mišnaic passage dealing with how the witnesses were inspired with awe.[433] The *gəmārāʾ* commenting upon the passage extends to several folios. In 38a it also confronts traditions and rabbis' teachings concerning human creation.

[430] Baskin 1995, 71.
[431] Baskin 2002, 49–50.
[432] Shachter & Freedman 1935, xi.
[433] Sefaria.org, The William Davidson Talmud, Sanhedrin 37a.

Sanhedrîn 38a refers to the Mišna and *bārāytāʾ* of the sages proposing that Adam, the first man, was created alone and last. This is to avoid the heretics', *mînîm*,[434] claim that there are many authorities in Heaven. Alternatively, Adam might have been created alone for the sake of the righteous and the wicked, so the righteous would not proclaim themselves as the children of the righteous, and the wicked would not consider themselves as children of the wicked. This is, indeed, an interesting egalitarian point which the account lengthily elaborates upon, however, not mentioning the creation of the first woman.

Interestingly, the account about Adam having been created alone continues referring to Proverbs 9:1–3 mentioning "wisdom",[435] *ḥoḵmâ*. Thus, the *bārāytāʾ* interprets that God had created the entire world by wisdom. Furthermore, other details of the verse are explained finally ending up with Adam and Eve. The topic, however, is not elaborated upon. As the account proceeds, the *gəmārāʾ* reports the primal woman having told the man to sin. In addition, the end of the folio – as well as the beginning of the next one, *Sanhedrîn 38b* – clarifies the substance of male creation: Adam's torso was made of dust from Babylonia, his head from Eretz Yisrael, *i.e.,* Palestine, and his limbs from the rest of the lands and so forth.

Next, a tradition by rabbi Yoḥanan b. Ḥanina (3rd-century Palestinian *āmôrāʾ*), according to which the creation of Adam can be divided into twelve hours,[436] is presented. The first hour, his dust was gathered, and during the second hour, he was made into a formless mass, *gôlem*.[437] Finally in the seventh hour, Eve was paired to him, *nizdawgâ lô Ḥawwâ,* most likely referring to sexual intercourse, and during the eighth hour they ascended to bed as two and descended as four, *i.e.,* their two sons had been born. The account does not mention Eve any further. Instead, Adam's first moments are lengthily described in connection with different biblical verses. Finally, a rabbi reports the language which Adam spoke – it was, naturally, Aramaic. In fact, this extremely common tradition containing a depiction of Adam's creation in twelve hours was introduced already in Leviticus Rabba 29:1.[438] The earlier version of the account does not, however, mention Eve. Instead, it concentrates on the fact that Adam sinned on the very first day of his creation.[439]

[434] Later censored as "Sadducees", according to Epstein 1935, 239.
[435] Sefaria.org, Proverbs 9:1–3.
[436] According to Grypeou & Spurling (2013, 40), dividing Adam's first day into twelve episodes is a widely preserved tradition in rabbinic sources of which a thorough comparison is given by Saldarini (1975, 303–305).
[437] The concept of *gôlem* seems to be equivalent to that given in Genesis Rabba 8:1 *(cf.* Theodor 1912, 55–56).
[438] Sefaria.org, Vayikra Rabbah 29:1.
[439] Grypeou & Spurling 2013, 43.

Sanhedrîn 39a mentions Gen. 2:21 in connection with an interesting accusation: A Roman emperor suggests, based on the verse, that God [of the Jews] is a thief as he took one of Adam's sides while he was sleeping. The daughter, supposedly of the emperor,[440] takes part in the discussion suggesting, through an example of a recently experienced larceny, that this was similarly good for Adam: God took a side from him and gave him a handmaid to serve him, *və-nātnû lô šifḥâ lə-šamšô.* When the emperor questions the timing of God's act, doing this when Adam was asleep, his daughter further demonstrates how repulsive a thing made of raw meat would be. Although the word *ṣelaʿ* seems to refer to an anatomical place, this account leaves it unspecified. Interestingly, the emperor's questions are answered by a woman.

The tradition cited above has much in common with Genesis Rabba 17:7 where a noble lady of non-Jewish origin poses a question about God's dubious act of stealing while Adam was sleeping.[441] Here, the daughter of the emperor already knows what rabbi Yose (b. Ḥalafta) teaches in the equivalent midrašic account: God's intention was to avoid Adam's loathing toward his wife-to-be. In both accounts, the surmise seems to be to prove that God bereaved only little and replaced it with much, and this had to be done in secret so that God's intention would actualize in the best possible way. The talmudic passage is more proclaiming whereas the account in Genesis Rabba is discursive with unexpected twists. The latter has been suggested to be more feminine and smoother.[442] Perhaps the most important difference between the traditions is the fact that in *Sanhedrîn 39a* the creation of woman is directly compared to that of a servant. Naturally, this evokes a question whether there is a political, cultural or simply linguistic background to this evolution in the legend.

The tractate returns to the creation of woman later on, in folio 107a. A rabbi speculates on the meaning of Psalms 38:18, "For I am on the verge of collapse, *lə-ṣelaʿ*, my pain is always with me". He narrates that Batševa was designated as a fit for David from the six days of the beginning. The rabbi seems to interpret the term *lə-ṣelaʿ* as earmarking – just like Ḥawwâ, taken from the *ṣelaʿ* of Ādām and designated for him, Batševa was that that for David. The passage strengthens the depiction of women as objects labelled according to their purpose in male reality.

[440] According to Raveh (2014, 151) there has been a lot of debate whether the daughter is that of the emperor or the rabbi to whom the emperor supposedly poses his question. Most scholars support the first option which is also my personal understanding based on the original text.
[441] Theodor 1912, 158.
[442] Raveh 2014, 151; for a thorough discussion on the differences between the midrašic and the talmudic versions of this tradition, see the entire Chapter 8 in Raveh's book.

5.5. *Sēder Ṭāhŏrôt* – Purification Rituals

The fifth order of the Talmud, named after "Sacred Things", *Qodāšîm*,[443] does not provide substantial material on the creation of woman. The next one, however, contributes to the topic in its only tractate, *Niddâ*.[444] *Sēder Ṭāhŏrôt*, "Cleannesses", serves as the last talmudic order. As easy to infer based on its name, it deals with the laws of clean and unclean things and persons.[445]

Niddâ 31b, 45b

The tractate of *Niddâ* is dedicated for discussing menstruation. The meaning of this word is, to be more precise, a menstruating woman, subjected to various restrictions due to her uncleanness.[446] After meandering transitions from a menstruation-related matter, *Niddâ 31b* poses a rhetorical question about why a man is constantly looking for a woman. This is due to the fact that he is looking for something he has lost, obviously referring to the substance originating in Ādām, of which the woman was created. Similarly, the sage is asked why the man lies his face downwards, most likely referring to sexual intercourse, whereas the woman lies her face upwards, thus, towards the man. The answer, attributed to rabbi Dostai (2nd-century *tannāʾ*), is that both of them face the material from which they were created. Based on this account, the sages understand male sexual dominance, inscribed from the moment of female creation, as part of a divine plan.

The previous account in *Niddâ 31b* is quite similar to a tradition in Genesis Rabba 17:8, attributed to rabbi Yehošua (b. Ḥanania), concerning the genders' position during birth.[447] Similarly, this passage asks why men are easily calmed down whereas women are not. The answer is, predictably, that the man inherits his nature from what he was created of. The same applies to the voice of both sexes. Otherwise, the traditions given in *Niddâ 31b* concentrate on menstruation and impurity.

The creation of woman is next confronted in *Niddâ 45b*. The passage first discusses the Mišna comparing girls and boys by their maturity to take a vow – a girl's vow stands one year younger than that of a boy.[448] When rabbi Simeon b. Eleazar (2nd-century *tannāʾ*) objects to the idea of a girl maturing earlier, rabbi Ḥisda refers to Gen. 2:22 interpreting that God granted the

[443] It comprises nine tractates mostly dealing with sacrifices.
[444] In the Mišna, however, the order is constituted of a total of twelve tractates (Epstein 1948, xiv–xv).
[445] Epstein 1948, xiii.
[446] Slotki 1948, xxvii; these restrictions seem to originate in Leviticus 15:19.
[447] *Cf.* Theodor 1912, 159.
[448] Sefaria.org, Mishnah, Niddah 5:6.

woman more understanding. Similarly to the discussion provided in Genesis Rabba 18:1, the conversation presents a connection between Gen. 2:22 containing the verb "build" and "understanding" as they share the two consonants of *bêt* and *nûn*.[449]

Next, a notion by Reš Lakiš (Simeon b. Lakiš) citing Simeon b. Menasya, is presented. It interprets the verse so that God plaited Eve's hair and brought her to Adam based on the fact that in the sea towns, the word for "building", *binyātāʾ,* is used also for "plaiting", *qəlîʿatāʾ*. An almost identical account is also given elsewhere in the Talmud (*Bərāḵôt 61a*) as summarized above. Furthermore, already in Genesis Rabba 18:1, a tradition attributed to rabbi Simeon b. Yoḥai proposes that God decorated Eve like a bride and brought her to Adam. This was reasoned by the fact that in some places people consider doing the hair as "building".[450]

Nevertheless, the discussion presented above ends with rabbi Samuel b. Isaac concludeing that a boy matures earlier since he frequently visits his teacher's house. This provides an audacious opposition to the above-mentioned mišnaic account about the earlier maturation of girls. It also represents a common endpoint of rabbinic discussions: although some female-favoring suggestions might be made, the last retort annuls them settling in misogynous atmosphere.

[449] *Cf*. Theodor 1912, 160.
[450] *Cf*. Theodor 1912, 160–161.

6. Geonic Augmentations to Rabbinic Interpretations

The last discursive stage analyzed in this study is that of the *gəʾônîm*, who can be defined as the heads of the academies in Babylonian Jewish centers, Sura and Pumpedita, although the academies later spread to other places of the Jewish world. This era is a loosely defined as the period of rabbinic activity from the 6th until the mid 11th century.[451] In the present study, however, the word "geonic" refers to the time period after the Babylonian Talmud, roughly between 650–900 CE, and not to the origin of the below-introduced writings as having been produced by *gəʾônîm*, nor to any specific geographical location. This time period can be characterized as exponential proliferation of Jewish scholarly writings, many of which suit well the category of rabbinic literature.

The rabbinic activity of *gəʾônîm* was based on an assumption that they had inherited the mantle of religious authority from their amoraic predecessors.[452] They were also the first to interpreted the Talmud,[453] and they most probably consolidated its status in the sacred literary history of Judaism.[454] The geonic sages were influential figures in rapidly developing Jewish communities,[455] but apparently they did not produce any comprehensive talmudic commentaries.[456] However, some individual explanations to certain talmudic passages have been preserved. This responsa literature – *šəʾēlôt û-təšûvôt*, "queries and replies" – mainly concentrated on halakhic matters.[457] The main trajectory of the geonic activity was towards standardization of the traditions and religious law.[458]

The geonic academies seem to have been quite different from the modern concept of *yəšîvâ*, although they have been considered as the starting point of this kind of religious education.[459] They became the dominant form of Jewish religious learning during the Islamic era. Although these academies were first formed in Babylonia, they spread to other parts of the Jewish world, particularly Palestine.[460] The best known *gāʾôn* is, self-explanatorily, Saadia ben Joseph Gaon (d. 942), having produced a massive amount of literature still known today.[461] One of his

[451] Brand *et al.* 2007, 380.
[452] Wald 2007b, 479.
[453] Wald 2007b, 479.
[454] Satlow 2006, 154; for an interesting comparison between geonic traditions and some specific features in Islam, see Satlow 2006, 149–165.
[455] Rubenstein 2003, 143.
[456] Wald 2007b, 479.
[457] Ta-Shma *et al.* 2007, 228–229; for encyclopedic introduction to responsa, see the entire article.
[458] Satlow 2006, 162.
[459] Satlow 2006, 154.
[460] Rubenstein 2003, 143–145.
[461] Halkin 2007.

famous literary works was an Arabic translation of the Hebrew Bible, adding importantly to the Arabic knowledge on Judaism. It has remained the standard Bible for Arabic-speaking Jews until modern times.[462]

6.1. *Targûm Yerûšalmî* – Targum Pseudo-Jonathan

There had already been translations of the Hebrew Bible before the Arabic one by Saadia Gaon. In fact, the earliest extant translation of the Pentateuch might have been produced during the first half of the third century BCE. This Greek translation, *Septuagint*, is traditionally attributed to 72 elders of Israel, six from each tribe, who allegedly translated the Tora in Alexandria, Egypt. It has been widely known – and used – ever since. In addition, a translation into Old Latin, *Vulgate*, was produced in the middle of the 3rd century CE.[463] Within Jewish tradition, however, the Aramaic translations, *targûmîm*, might have gained the most popularity.

The word *targûm* derives from a semitic root bearing a meaning of explaining and/or translating. This process can, naturally, occur between any languages. In rabbinic context, however, *targûmîm* (pl.) refer to hermeneutic translations of the Hebrew Bible in Aramaic.[464] Therefore, they can be seen as part of the oral Tora.[465] It is widely acknowledged that an attempt to translate always contains an interpretative tone to which the *targûmîm* are not an exception.[466] The earliest *targûmîm* originated in Second Temple Judaism.[467] Of the several targumic works known until today, that of Onqelos, known for its Babylonian origin, serves as the most literal translation of the Pentateuch.[468]

Targum Pseudo-Jonathan to the Pentateuch, as most scholars call the targumic work analyzed in the present study, is considered one of the most important Aramaic attempts to transmit the content of the written Tora.[469] The work, originally known as *Targûm Yerûšalmî*,[470] provides a complete manuscript to the entire Pentateuch.[471] The compilation was earlier thought to represent the Palestinian targumic tradition, but recent manuscript discoveries have changed

[462] Halkin 2007, 612.
[463] Sarna *et al.* 2007, 595–598.
[464] Sarna *et al.* 2007, 588; technically, the originally Aramaic portions of the Bible are also covered by this term.
[465] About the position of *targûmîm* as part of the interpretative tradition, see Samely 1994.
[466] Klein *et al.* 2011, 3.
[467] Cook 2012, 95.
[468] Klein *et al.* 2011, 3.
[469] Hayward 2010, 126.
[470] The history of this term lies in erroneous interpretation of the abbreviation *tāw–yôd*, apparently standing for *Targûm Yerûšalmî,* but reinterpreted as Targum Jonathan (*e.g.*, Flesher & Chilton 2011, 72).
[471] Flesher & Chilton 2011, 87.

the big picture.[472] It also differs, in many ways, from the corpus of Palestinian *targûmîm*.[473] Its content seems more likely to derive from Targum Onqelos and its dialect reveals a later dating of the text compared to both Targum Onqelos and the Palestinian Targums. Targum Pseudo-Jonathan is composed in late Jewish literary Aramaic,[474] a hybrid language representing a mixture of Palestinian elements with linguistic features typical for Eastern Aramaic.[475]

The text of Targum Pseudo-Jonathan contains both literal translation as well as a huge number of additions. Many of these augmentations are not found anywhere else in targumic literature.[476] Some of them represent halakhic material whereas others bear an aggadic agenda.[477] It has been suggested that this translation lacks the typical features of oral transmission detectable in other *targûmîm*. The traditions presented in it seem to originate in late midrašic works.[478] For example, its potential dependence on Pirkei de-Rabbi Eliezer, presented later in this chapter of the present study, has been anxiously discussed among scholars.[479]

The dating of Targum Pseudo-Jonathan has been challenging and vastly argued upon. There are unquestionably post-Islamic elements in it.[480] For instance, the work mentions names of a wife and a daughter attributed to the Islamic character of Muḥammad, and it also contains some anti-Muslim polemics. Naturally, this does not confirm that the entire work would have been composed as late as the seventh century – these features may also represent later insertions.[481] Nevertheless, based on the evidence provided in research literature, it seems rational to consider the addition introduced below to be quite a late element, regardless of whether it was incorporated into earlier tradition or was a part of it to begin with. The consensus seems to be that Targum Pseudo-Jonathan is not earlier than the 7th century.[482]

Targum Pseudo-Jonathan is expansive – indeed, the text is almost twice as long as the Hebrew Pentateuch.[483] The translation based on the beginning of Genesis, however, is quite literal and it closely follows the Hebrew text. Nevertheless, there are a number of clarifications for certain matters. For instance, the creation of man in the second creation account, in Gen.

[472] Flesher & Chilton 2011, 72.
[473] Cook 1987, xii.
[474] Flesher & Chilton 2011, 72–73, 88; detailedly described in Kaufman 2013.
[475] Maher 1992, 2; for a detailed work on the language of Targum Pseudo-Jonathan, see Cook's PhD study (1987).
[476] Flesher & Chilton 2011, 73, 88; for a detailed analysis of the additions, see Shin'an 1991.
[477] Maher 1992, 2–8.
[478] Hayward 2010, 127.
[479] Maher 1992, 11.
[480] Flesher & Chilton 2011, 88.
[481] Maher 1992, 11.
[482] Sarna *et al.* 2007, 591.
[483] Sarna *et al.* 2007, 591.

2:7, is described so that God created man in two formations, taking dust from the place of the sanctuary and the four winds of the world, mixed from all the waters of the world, and creating him red, black, and white.[484]

Concerning the creation of woman, a remarkable insertion is found in connection with verse Gen. 2:21.[485] It reads as follows: and the Lord God threw a deep slumber upon Adam, and he slept. And He took one of his ribs, *û-nəsîv ḥădāʾ mē-ʿilʿôhî,* it was the thirteenth rib of the right side, *hûʾ ʿilāʿâ təlîsrît də-min səṭar yəmînāʾ*.[486] The passage adds a new detail to the biblical text identifying the rib of Adam, of which the first woman was built, as the thirteenth. This consolidates the understanding of the original Hebrew word *ṣelaʿ* as a substance numerously found in a human being.

The interpretation of Gen. 2:21 in Targum Pseudo-Jonathan holds an interesting linguistic aspect. Whereas the rabbis have earlier interpreted the word *ṣelaʿ* meaning *səṭar*, "side", in Aramaic,[487] this passage uses both of the words – the Aramaic equivalent, *ilāʿ*, and *səṭar* – but with distinct meanings. A previous tradition presented in Genesis Rabba 17:6, and attributed to rabbi Samuel, had already used the term *ʿilʿāʾ* as an Aramaic word for *ṣelaʿ*,[488] but this passage finally seems to settle with the terminology so that *ʿilʿāʾ*, referring to the substance of female origin, is strictly different from *səṭar*, representing the location of this substance and further strengthened by an attribute. Not only does this thwart the tannaitic tradition containing Aramaic attempts to explain Gen. 2:21, but it also condenses the understanding of the substance to be clearly anatomical.

6.2. *Āvôt də-Rabbî Nātān* – Fathers According to Rabbi Nathan

Āvôt də-Rabbî Nātān (Avot de-Rabbi Nathan, *i.e.*, Fathers According to Rabbi Nathan) became known in academic context in 1887 when S. Schechter published it with *variae lectiones*, notes and a comprehensive introduction.[489] It is a commentary of the mišnaic tractate *Āvôt*.[490] Besides ethical sayings, there are many historical traditions and tales in it.[491] Avot de-Rabbi Nathan is

[484] Sefaria.org, Targum Jonathan on Genesis 2:7.
[485] Sefaria.org, Genesis 2:21.
[486] Sefaria.org, Targum Jonathan on Genesis 2:21.
[487] *E.g.*, Genesis Rabba 8:1 and 17:6; Leviticus Rabba 14:1.
[488] *Cf.* Theodor 1912, 157.
[489] Schofer 2005, 25; L. Finkelstein made some major correction to Schechter's work in *Mavo le-Massektot Avot ve-Avot d'Rabbi Natan* (1950).
[490] Also known as *Pirqêy Āvôt*; for an encyclopedic introduction to *Āvôt*, see Tropper 2007.
[491] Kister 2007, 750.

almost entirely written in Hebrew,[492] which is similar to mišnaic language of the tannaitic period – in addition, Aramaic and Greek are present to a minor extent. However, it has been proposed that the language cannot determine either the place or the date of the composition of Avot de-Rabbi Nathan.[493] There are two different recensions of this work, conventionally known as A and B. Since the 16th century, version A has been printed as a part of the minor tractates of the Babylonian Talmud. These versions seem to be two distinct forms of an earlier work.[494]

Rabbi Nathan was a widely-known late-2nd-century figure to whom, however, Avot de-Rabbi Nathan is unlikely to be attributed.[495] In fact, it is not known when the writing got the name we now call it.[496] Nevertheless, the text seems to be created over several centuries by different editors.[497] Based on a detailed comparison with parallel material in the talmudic literature, both version of Avot de-Rabbi Nathan are post-talmudic. Thus, the final redaction is dated between the 6th and the 8th centuries. Although both versions seem mostly Palestinian, particularly recension A encompasses some Babylonian influence.[498]

Of the two recensions of Avot de-Rabbi Nathan, only traditions of recension B are presented in connection with this study. This is due to the fact that they contain parallel traditions and recension A does not add to the big picture provided by B. The latter also contains more material on the primal woman, Ḥawwâ, whereas her role seems narrowed in recension A.[499] In an important translation project, A. Saldarini divides version B into three sections to which he also gives different categorizations. First of them, chapters 1–30 which most of the passages analyzed below belong to, serves mostly as a commentary to *Pirqêy Āvôt* 1–2. Based on the fact that this part, although commenting on the Mišna and being therefore quite similar to the Bavli, lacks the extensive argumentations typical for the Talmud, Saldarini characterizes this part as *midrāš.* Furthermore, the traditions included in Avot de-Rabbi Nathan are understood as tannaitic, not amoraic. Its style is mainly expositional rather than homiletical.[500]

[492] Schofer 2005, 27.
[493] Saldarini 1975, 11–12.
[494] Kister 2007, 750.
[495] Kister 2007, 750.
[496] Saldarini 1975, 8; Schofer 2005, 27.
[497] Schofer 2005, 27.
[498] Kister 2007, 750; for a thorough discussion on dating and challenges in it, as well as defining the birth place of the text, see Saldarini 1975, 12–17.
[499] Polzer 2012, 229.
[500] Saldarini 1975, 4–5.

Chapter 1 of Avot de-Rabbi Nathan begins with God glorifying Moses,[501] after which it moves on to portray the beginning of all with the revealing of the Tora to Moses.[502] Adam is mentioned in connection with the tree of knowledge, reflecting Gen. 2:16–17 and 3:1–3, whereas Eve is introduced as the fool, although not informed properly by Adam, who the serpent found persuadable to transgression. This tradition seems to depict women as easily influenced, and this attribute is given to women independently from the event known as the "Fall" of human. Furthermore, the passage specifies that Eve used to call Adam her "Master" even before the incident.[503] One cannot avoid an impression that this notion is meant to advocate the subordination of women.

Next, the chapter proceeds to discuss the creation of man. It specifies each hour of the procedure, lasting a total of 12 hours, however, not mentioning the primal woman. This differs from a similar account given in the Talmud, *Sanhedrîn 38b*, where a tradition attributed to rabbi Yoḥanan b. Ḥanina divides the creation of Adam into twelve hours, and Eve was paired to him during the seventh hour. Avot de-Rabbi Nathan possibly returns to her briefly in Chapter 2 in a statement according to which Adam had only one wife – and as rabbi Yehuda b. Bathyra (1st-century *tannāʾ*) speculates, if God had meant ten wives to Adam, he would have given them, but instead he considered appropriate to give him only one.[504] The passage is obviously meant to advocate monogyny which was not self-evident in the Judaism of the time.[505] Another potential explanation is that this was mentioned as an objection to speculations concerning Lilith which might have occurred within the Jewish community, as evident from Alphabet of Ben Sira, introduced below.

Chapter 8 of Avot de-Rabbi Nathan gives several traditions regarding the creation of human, first referring to teachings of rabbi Yehuda (b. Ilai) who suggests that God already busied himself with a bride at the beginning. This is based on the rabbi's interpretation of Gen. 2:22 in which God brings the woman to the man. Rabbi Simeon b. Menasya adds that the verse means that God adorned her for Adam. He proceeds, referring to the word "built" mentioned in Gen. 2:22 for the creation process of the woman, that hair-plaiting is somewhere expressed using *bnyyt*, an Aramaic version of the Hebrew root of *bny*.[506] This tradition is equivalent to three

[501] Schechter 1887, 1–4.
[502] In fact, a similar pattern has been present in Jewish texts since the time before the common era – the concept is known, for instance, from Jubilees.
[503] Schechter 1887, 5–8.
[504] Schechter 1887, 8–10.
[505] About Jewish polygyny in Roman Palestine, see Schremer 1997.
[506] Schechter 1887, 22.

accounts in the Bavli (*Bərāḵôt 61a, Šabbāt 95a,* and *Niddâ 45b*) and attributed to the same rabbi. In fact, a somewhat similar account, although in connection with rabbi Simeon b. Yoḥai's teachings, is also given in Genesis Rabba 18:1.[507]

Next, the account refers to Psalm 139:5 and its "You hedge me before and behind, *āḥôr vā-qedem ṣartānî* ", mentioned multiple times in the previous writings introduced in this study. Here, the rabbis give several potential interpretations of the passage in connection with creation.[508] One of them is, interestingly, an idea of simultaneous creation of both sexes. However, a rhetorical question about why the woman was not given to Adam immediately is posed, and it is also answered by a narrative where God knew Adam would make complaints about the woman had she been created at the same time. This tradition remarkably resembles the one in Genesis Rabba 17:4.[509] Thus, the possibility of simultaneous creation is instantly overruled by depicting a consecutive process.

Adam is told to have complained to God about not having a mate. When he finally meets Eve, he understands her being "bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh", just like written in Gen. 2:23. Based on this inference, a man is to take the daughter of his fellowman, increase and multiply. God acted as Adam's best man, but a man has to get his own in the future.[510] This passage, emphasizing the importance of marriage and the exceptionality of the first marriage, acts as a transition to the next tradition.

The next account, attributed to rabbi Yehošua, provides a tradition on a Roman matrona who contests why God (of the Jews) had to create the world by theft. The rabbi involved in the discussion denies this and explains the rationality of the incidents at the beginning of times with a parable. This account is quite similar to the traditions provided in Genesis Rabba 17:7 and *Sanhedrîn 39a.* For example, the midrašic passage presents a noble lady having a conversation with rabbi Yose (b. Ḥalafta), wondering why God had to create the woman while Adam slept. There, the lady herself makes a parable with the rabbi's answer, mentioning that she had been arranged to marry her uncle, but as she had grown up in the same household, she was not appealing in his eyes and he chose another woman.[511] Similarly, this passage in Avot de-Rabbi Nathan goes on explaining that if a girl is grown up in the same household with a man, he does not marry her since he considers her as his sister. Furthermore, if a man meets a girl full of

[507] *Cf.* Theodor 1912, 161.
[508] Schechter 1887, 22–23.
[509] *Cf.* Theodor 1912, 155–156.
[510] Schechter 1887, 23.
[511] *Cf.* Theodor 1912, 158.

blood, *i.e.*, menstruating, he is disgusted. The lady of this account individualizes the man she was expected to marry as a cousin, but the tradition is otherwise analogous.[512]

The discussion on Gen. 2:23 is further elaborated upon in Chapter 9, the first tradition of which remarkably resembles a similar account given in Genesis Rabba 17:8 attributed to rabbi Yehošua (b. Ḥanania), as well.[513] The beginning of the chapter asks why it is hard to conciliate a woman. This, according to the passage, is due to the fact that woman was created out of a bone which does not soften if you put it into water. Similarly, given as answers to rhetorical questions, a woman has to adorn herself as flesh gets ruined it you don't put spices in it. This applies to the female voice, as well: if you place a bone into a pot, the voice travels and people know what is in it. The man deposits his sperm into a woman, and not the other way around, and it is the man who makes demands on the woman as the man seeks for something that was taken from him. The woman looks at the man since she was created from him.[514]

The previous account strongly consolidates the understanding of female origin as a bone. It also takes many female characteristics for granted. For instance, a woman is to adorn herself and her voice has a special tone, whereas the man has a privilege of depositing sperm into a woman – and to make demands. The creation account is used to justify the male dominion over women, even their sexual exploitation. Instead of providing a coherent narrative about the female fate, as in Genesis Rabba 17:8, this passage depicts their subordination as axiomatic.

Next, the discussion gets a more accusative tone. A woman has to cover as she has disgraced herself and, thus, she has to be ashamed in front of people. She has been given the plight of dying during labor as a punishment from her offenses regarding menstrual purity, dough offering, and lightening the shabbat candles. In fact, the commandments were given to her because Eve spilled Adam's blood although he was a pure dough offering by God. She made him impure, although he was the light of God who brought light to the world. Indeed, Adam was the blood of the whole universe. These offenses will be punished with death in connection with childbirth.[515] In comparison with its counterpart in Genesis Rabba, this explication on the guiltiness of Eve and the consequences of her actions is fatalistic – and the subsequent punishment is announced with a far-reaching affirmation. Naturally, this deduction relies on the Fall episode and not solely on the secondary creation of the female gerder.

[512] Schechter 1887, 23–24.
[513] *Cf.* Theodor 1912, 158–159.
[514] Schechter 1887, 24–25.
[515] Schechter 1887, 24.

Although Chapter 42 of Avot de-Rabbi Nathan mostly discusses the events after the "Fall" episode, it also provides some new insight into the creation. It introduces the cascade of Adam's creation in twelve stages, however, not mentioning the creation of Eve.[516] The passage lengthily elaborates on Adam's doings and finally lists ten commands concerning his wife: menstruation when she is expelled from her house and prohibited from her husband, giving birth in nine months, nursing for two years, being ruled by her husband, making her husband jealous over other men, aging fast, stopping giving birth unlike men when aging, staying inside her house and not being able to show herself in public, covering her hair like a mourner, and being buried by her husband if she is righteous.[517]

According to the end of the chapter, Adam was the blood of the world,[518] as already mentioned in Chapter 9, and as woman brought death upon him, she was punished with menstrual purity. Similarly, Adam was the dough offering and she made him impure, so the woman was put under obligation of dough offering. Adam was also the light of the world, so she is to take care of the Shabbat lights. These are the three potential sins for which women die in childbirth.[519] As a matter of fact, they are already mentioned in the Yerušalmi, *Šabbāt 2*.[520] However, these conclusions are not directly derived from details of the creation.

6.3. *Pirqêy də-Rabbî Ĕlîʿezer* – Chapters of Rabbi Eliezer

Pirqêy də-Rabbî Ĕlîʿezer (Pirkei de-Rabbi Eliezer, *i.e.*, Chapters of Rabbi Eliezer) was a popular midrašic work cited widely by sages of the following generations.[521] It might be best characterized as an expanded aggadic narrative,[522] although it has also been classified as rewritten Bible,[523] retelling the primeval history from the beginning until Israel's peregrination in the desert. At some point of its medieval history, Pirkei de-Rabbi Eliezer was mistakenly attributed to rabbi Eliezer b. Hurcanus, a well-known tannaitic sage, due to its opening words specifying the matter as such.[524]

[516] *Cf. a* similar account in Chapter 1 (Schechter 1887, 9–10).
[517] Schechter 1887, 123–124.
[518] It has been proposed that the word Adam and the word for blood, bearing root consonants *dmm*, was pronounced similarly in ancient Palestine (Saldarini referring to Lieberman in note 11, p. 83, 1975).
[519] Schechter 1887, 124.
[520] Sefaria.org, Jerusalem Talmud, Shabbat 2; Boyarin 1995, 90–91.
[521] Adelman 2009, 3.
[522] Herr 2007b, 182; for genre and characteristics of Pirkei de-Rabbi Eliezer, see Adelman 2009, 6–21.
[523] Adelman 2009, 4; for discussion on Pirkei de-Rabbi Eliezer as pseudepigraphy, see Adelman 2009, 25–33.
[524] Herr 2007b, 182.

The text of Pirkei de-Rabbi Eliezer is written in partly-artificial Hebrew, containing a few Greek words. The author seems to have widely utilized earlier rabbinic works from tannaitic and amoraic periods, however, remarkably revising his sources. In addition, an evident influence of textual tradition of Second Temple Judaism, particularly Jubilees, can be seen. Unlike many rabbinic writings, Pirkei de-Rabbi Eliezer was probably composed by a single author.[525] Thus, its dating is a bit easier than in the case of many other rabbinic texts. First, the work is rich in customs present in Palestine in the beginning of the geonic era. Second, there are a number of Arabic legends and portrayals of the Omayyad dynasty, hoping for its fall.[526] Third, it is cited in two Jewish writings dated to the 8th–9th centuries.[527] Based on these notions, there is strong evidence that this text was composed in Palestine during the first half of the eighth century.[528] The style of Pirkei de-Rabbi Eliezer has been noted to reflect early geonic interpretation.[529]

Concerning the creation of woman, it adds remarkably to amoraic explications. First, Chapter 11 describes the work of creation during the sixth day. It describes the dust for human creation being from four corners of the world.[530] Although this tradition is similar to some previous ones, it also depicts the creation of human in four colors, according to these corners, lengthily elaborating on the purpose of this.[531] The passage proceeds describing the creation of Adam divided into twelve-hour steps, during the seventh of which Eve was joined to him.[532] A similar division has previously been seen in the Bavli, *Sanhedrîn 38b*. However, all potential direct talmudic quotations in Pirkei de-Rabbi Eliezer are exclusively from the Palestinian Talmud.[533]

Chapter 12 of Pirkei de-Rabbi Eliezer, dedicated to Adam in paradise, continues the narrative already started in the previous chapter. The passage describes God saying that he is alone in his world and [Adam] is alone, *yāḥîd*, in his.[534] This indicates that Adam was created as a single being, not simultaneously with Eve, a possibility upon which earlier sages had elaborated.[535] This detail seems to nullify the centuries-long collective effort of the rabbis trying to solve the discrepancy between the two creation accounts, specifically in connection with human

[525] Adelman 2009, 23.
[526] Herr 2007b, 182; for details concerning the connection with Islam, see Adelman 2009, 35–42.
[527] Adelman 2009, 35.
[528] Herr 2007b, 182.
[529] Sacks 2009, 7–11.
[530] Sefaria.org, Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer 11:5.
[531] Sefaria.org, Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer 11:6.
[532] Sefaria.org, Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer 11:7.
[533] Friedlander 1916, xix.
[534] Sefaria.org, Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer 12:4.
[535] *Cf*. Genesis Rabba 8:1 (Theodor 1912, 54–55).

creation. Furthermore, the account refers to Gen. 2:18 and God's idea to "make a fitting helper for him" in it. This is actually God's solution to the problem that if Adam would not reproduce, all other creatures would mistakenly think that it was Adam who created them. This interesting reasoning is novel in rabbinic tradition – and by all means, it makes the creation of woman seem both selfish and childish, far from "perfection" as the creation of human is often characterized.

Gen. 2:18 is further commented by rabbi Yehuda (b. Ilai) stating that if he (Adam) is fortunate, *zāḵâ*, she will be a help meet for him, *kə-negdô*, but if not, she shall be against him and fight him.[536] This is remarkably similar to a passage in the Talmud, *Yəvāmôt 63a*, presenting rabbi Eleazar (b. Šammua) speculating over the meaning of the same verse: if a man is fortunate, his wife helps him, but if he is not fortunate, she is against him. These linguistically reasoned interpretations are attributed to different persons, but they use similar phrasing, obviously representing the same tradition. Remarkably, this passage seems to consider man's fate coincidental, as it would be only a matter of luck how the "help" assigned for him turns out to be. This may well reflect the author's assumption of the capricious nature of women.

The chapter proceeds describing the actions of God in Gen. 2:21. However, it explains God having had compassion upon Adam. Therefore, he would cast a deep sleep upon the man so that he would not feel any pain during the procedure described next. God took a bone from his sides, *eṣem miṣ-ṣalʿōtāw,* and flesh from his heart, *bāšar mil-libbô,* and made it a "help" placing it opposite to him (Adam).[537] This passage clearly takes the anatomical reading of the original terminology for granted. Besides this, it introduces a totally new concept of flesh originating from Adam's heart. This addition can be seen as a notable expansion to the original narrative – it strengthens the idea of female origin in the male body.

When Adam woke up from his sleep, seeing the woman standing opposite to him, he said "bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh", equivalent to (Gen. 2:23). However, the passage further elaborates on the matter stating that his name was called Ādām, *i.e.,* "man" only as long as he stayed alone.[538] This serves as the beginning of a typical rabbinic discussion, this time on Adam's name. First, rabbi Yehuda (b. Ilai) presents that this name is due to his origin in earth, *ădāmâ.* Rabbi Yehošua b. Korḥa (2nd-century *tannāʾ*) opposes this, proposing that he was called Ādām due to his flesh and blood, *dām*. Furthermore, when the "help" was built for him, his

[536] Sefaria.org, Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer 12:5.
[537] Sefaria.org, Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer 12:7.
[538] Sefaria.org, Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer 12:7.

name became *ēš,* fire, as was the woman's name.[539] Then, God put his own name, *yôd hê*, between their names so that they would be relieved from all distress. And if they would not walk in his ways, God would take his name from their names and they would become fire,[540] as in Job 31:12.[541] Indeed, the original Hebrew words used in Gen. 2:23 for man and woman, *îš* and *iššâ,* differ from *ēš* by these letters, *i.e.*, *yôd* makes the word mean "man" and *hê* makes it a "woman". This amplification is somewhat peculiar, and it seemingly adds to the interpretive tradition.

In Chapter 13, the text proceeds to discuss the serpent. It mentions Eve in this context, however, not adding namely to the creation story. In the next chapter (14), this matter is further elaborated, detailedly describing the sin of the primal human beings. Compared to earlier rabbinic works, it expands Eve's curses by adding several new punishments.[542] Although chapters 19–20 also discuss the first deeds of Adam, they do not mention his mate, Eve. Furthermore, next chapters, particularly 21–22, clearly add to the Garden narrative, but they do not provide any new insight into the creation of woman.

6.4. *Ālefbêt də-Bēn Sîrāʾ* – Alphabet of Ben Sira

Besides its name referring to Ben Sira, a sage from the 3rd or the 2nd century BCE, *Ālefbêt də-Bēn Sîrāʾ* (Alphabet of Ben Sira) does not have much in common with the widely-known pseudepigraphal work and the original proverbs of Ben Sira. Instead, it is characterized as a satirical work representing the geonic period of Jewish interpretive tradition. In fact, it serves as one of the earliest – if not the earliest – parodies in Jewish literature.[543] Alphabet of Ben Sira has been suggested to have aimed at reforming rabbinic exegesis.[544] It is described as an anthology of indecents, sometimes also containg misogynous parodies of midrašic traditions.[545]

Alphabet of Ben Sira was most likely written by a single unknown author in the Eastern areas of the Jewish settlement.[546] It frequently refers to rabbinic literature,[547] presenting itself as an expansion to previous traditions. The work has been dated to the geonic era, more precise-

[539] Sefaria.org, Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer 12:8.
[540] Sefaria.org, Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer 12:9.
[541] Sefaria.org, Job 31:12.
[542] Kvam *et al.* 1999, 136.
[543] Dan 2007; Stern 2004.
[544] Börner-Klein 2010, 144.
[545] Baskin 2002, 58.
[546] Dan 2007.
[547] Börner-Klein 2010, 142.

ly between the 8th and the 10th centuries.[548] Although many later authorities rejected the work, it became a popular part of midrašic tradition.[549] There are more than 100 Hebrew manuscripts of the text supporting this notion.[550] They seem to have undergone some degree of censorship in the course of time.[551]

The compilation of Alphabet of Ben Sira can be divided into four parts based on their style and content. The first part appears as a biography of Ben Sira until the age of one. Second, a more sophisticated part describes Ben Sira's teacher trying to teach him alphabets to which Ben Sira responds with epigrams beginning with each letter. The third part, serving as the longest one, portrays Ben Sira's life and adventures in ancient Babylonian court.[552] It contains versatile legends, including folklore, from outside of the canonical rabbinic literature.[553] Alphabetically arranged epigrams are given in part four of the work.[554]

The 34th chapter of Alphabet of Ben Sira is particularly interesting regarding the topic of this study. It contains Ben Sira's answer to Nebuchadnezzar, the king of Babylon, about the use of amulets. The passage describes that when God created Adam, who was alone, he also created a woman. She was created from the earth, just like Adam, and called *Lîlît* (Lilith).[555] Lilith is known already from ancient Sumerian demonology, and its Babylonian counterpart, *lilitu*, was a succubus, seducing men in their sleep.[556] Later, it became an essential part of Jewish demonology, as well.[557]

There is only one clear reference to Lilith in the Hebrew Bible,[558] found in Isaiah 34:14,[559] whereas the Talmud mentions the name in a few occasions. For instance, *Šabbāt 151b* portrays her as an evil spirit, and according to rabbi Ḥanina, it is prohibited to sleep alone in a house as anyone who does so will be seized by this creature. In *ʿĒrûvîn 100b*, in turn, she is described to have a female face and long hair – and wings in *Niddâ 24b*. However, these talmudic passages do not connect the figure with the events of human creation. In addition, a Lilith-like creature is referred to already in Genesis Rabba 18:4 and 22:7,[560] containing two passages de-

[548] Börner-Klein 2010, 136; Stern 2004, 427.
[549] Dan 2007.
[550] Börner-Klein 2010, 135.
[551] Dan 2007.
[552] Dan 2007.
[553] Börner-Klein 2010, 136; Stern 2004, 428–429.
[554] Dan 2007.
[555] Sefaria.org, The Aleph Bet of ben Sira 34.
[556] Lesses 2005, 5458.
[557] Scholem 2007, 17.
[558] Lesses 2005, 5458.
[559] Sefaria.org, Isaiah 34:14.
[560] *Cf.* Theodor 1912, 163–164, 213.

scribing a concept of "the first Ḥawwâ". This concept, finally named as Lilith, offers a distinctive solution to the classical exegetic problem caused by the two somewhat different creation accounts.

The narrative of Alphabet of Ben Sira continues describing the two, Adam and Lilith, immediately beginning to fight. She insists that she would not lie below (him), whereas he said that he would not lie under her, but only on top, since she is fit only to be in the bottom position and he is the superior one.[561] The passage indicates that man's position is superior to that of women, a supposition consolidating female inferiority as the natural order of human life. Lilith is depicted as a rebellious, even disastrous departure from this normativized concept.

Lilith responds insisting that the two are equal to each other as they were both created from the earth. Although the substance of human creation is only given in Gen. 2:7, this account seems to refer to human creation in Gen. 1:27 and the potentially simultaneous creation of both sexes in it. Next, Lilith pronounces the unspeakable name [of God] and flies away. Adam, instead, weeping that the woman God had given to him has run away, prays for his creator to send his three angels to bring her back. God tells Adam that if she does not agree to come back, she has to permit a hundred of her children to die daily.[562]

The angels go off to chase Lilith, reaching her in the middle of the sea. They repeat God's words, but she would not return. The angels threaten that they would drown her in the sea, but she refuses saying that she had been created only to cause sickness to infants: if the infant is male, she has power over him for eight days after his birth, and in the case of a female child, for twenty days. The angels still request her to go back, but Lilith swears by God's name that whenever she sees them or their names or their forms in an amulet, she would have no power over that infant. Furthermore, Lilith agrees to a hundred of her children dying every day. Thus, one hundred demons succumb every day, and people write the angels' names on the amulets of their children. When Lilith would notice the names, she remembers her oath and the child recuperates.[563]

Naturally, the account provides a rationale for the protective effectiveness of amulets, common at the time of the composition of Alphabet of Ben Sira. However, there seems to be much more to it than one may first think. For example, the passage goes against many previously common traditions by depicting the figure of Lilith as a hunter of children and their mothers, not the men. It differs from earlier traditions also by reordering the image of Lilith, concom-

[561] Sefaria.org, The Aleph Bet of ben Sira 34.
[562] Sefaria.org, The Aleph Bet of ben Sira 34.
[563] Sefaria.org, The Aleph Bet of ben Sira 34.

itantly resorting to the mythology of Eve. It has been suggested that comparison of the first women, Lilith and Eve, can be concluded so that both women are seen as sexual objects. Their reproductive function is also an essential part of Jewish interpretive tradition.[564] Perhaps most importantly, the story of Lilith teaches women that demanding equality can have serious consequences as she, herself, became a devil who loses her own children – even on a daily basis.

[564] Kosior 2018, 116–122.

7. Conclusions – Evolution of Rabbinic Discourse on Creation of Woman

During the half-millennium-long time period of rabbinic activity addressed in the present study, wide circulation of religious writings was evident. Based on the passages analyzed above, there was a Palestinian predominance in Genesis Rabba so that of the over twenty rabbis' names, only two were of Babylonian *āmôrāʾîm*. However, the situation was not much different in passages extracted from the Babylonian Talmud – of the about thirty sages mentioned, only five were of Babylonian origin. This may be interpreted so that in connection with the creation of woman, the main corpus of traditions was established rather early on – and in Palestine. This notion strengthens the presumption that after the establishment of the tradition ensemble, mainly reinforcing modifications and preferences were made. Later on, however, pregnant elaborations also took place.

There were quite a few traditions which were almost identical between Genesis Rabba and Bavli, some of them being transmitted until the geonic period. For example, the word "built" was interpreted as adorning the primal woman in Genesis Rabba, three passages from Bavli, and finally in Avot de-Rabbi Nathan. In addition, the discussion which a noble matrona takes part in is also present in the three compositions. The development of these individual traditions, however, cannot be used to conclude a certain tendency in the process. Nevertheless, the evolution in both of them can be seen towards intransigence and straightforwardness. In many cases, concepts potentially favorable for women were forgotten along the development of rabbinic discourse.

Based on the analyses of the present study, the evolution of rabbinic discourse on the creation of woman can be divided into three consecutive discursive stages. The first one of them can be seen as establishing the tannaitic corpus of aggadic traditions, discussed versatilely in *midrāšîm* compiled into literary compositions during the 5th century. Specifically *midrāš* based on Genesis, Genesis Rabba, presents diverse perspectives into the matter. The *midrāšîm* concerning the creation of woman were built upon tannaitic traditions and consolidated by early amoraic notions.

Harmonizing the two somewhat different kinds of biblical creation stories concerning the human creation was one of the most important motivations for the discussions cited above – in fact, one potential solution, the primal androgyne, is already introduced in the beginning of the first section discussing human creation in Genesis Rabba, and the tradition is also given in Leviticus Rabba. The rabbis bring up numerous explications on how the dissociation of genders could have happened. However, already at this discursive stage this seems to be a minority

view. Creation of genders was, after all, understood as two consecutive events. Interestingly, potential discrepancies within the biblical text were solved, among others, by referring to deliberate changes made in the course of time.

The rabbis of the first discursive stage brought up a possible translation for *ṣela'* so that it should be understood as a "side" as almost everywhere else in the Hebrew Bible. However, the consensus seems to opt for "bone" as the ultimate origin of woman. Based on the substance Eve was created from, women stink and have shrilling voices. Their dubious characteristics, too, are evident in the rabbinic passages time and again. The indigenous feebleness of women is only one of the potential justifications for their subordination. This born nature, already evident in the creation, determines the position of women and their ideal characteristics: passivity, humbleness, and modesty. In addition, women are seen as property of their male relatives.

The purpose of Eve's creation is discussed throughout the material from the first discursive stage. Eve was given to Adam for his vitality and to serve as his helper so that her individual status seems to get minimized. Indeed, the divine plan to make human in God's own image, and the obligation to subdue the earth, is relevant only for men. As woman's creation was derivative, dependent on the man, she is concomitantly made inferior. Based on the biblical text concerning the creation of human, the rabbis attest that man has to subjugate his wife and confine her indoors. Furthermore, the man is to insert sperm into her and make demands upon her. Women's role is mainly domestic and ornamental – she must be entertaining for her husband. As a matter of fact, the rabbis advocate marriage as an ultimate perfection of creation in numerous occasions, explicating numerous linguistic features of the biblical passage accordingly.

In addition to her name being linguistically related to the treacherous serpent of the Garden, the creation of Eve is juxtaposed with that of Satan, and her creation is already linked to the sorrowful turn in the history of humankind. Indeed, women seem to be opposite to the original divine intention. Many of the notions given as part of the biblical interpretation by the sages strengthen the impression of women's otherness.

The second discursive stage dating to the 6th century can be perceived through passages of the Babylonian Talmud, ground mainly by the amoraic sages, which reinforce the previous traditions. Although some female-favoring notions might have been made, the outcome of the rabbinic discussions frequently annul them by settling in a misogynous atmosphere. The linguistic features of the biblical account on the creation of woman was used to explain her basic shape, ideal for bearing a child. However, she is also acknowledged for her entertaining potential. Physical disparity of woman is emphasized in many ways.

The potentially androgynous primal being discussed during the previous phase of interpretive tradition was not mentioned anymore at this discursive stage. The harmonization efforts concerning the two distinct narratives of human creation were continued, but the outcome of the lengthy discussions on whether Eve was originally a second face or just a tail of the primal male being all seem to encompass an idea of a – small – female motif in him. As the origin of woman is in man, based on the amoraic elaborations, only the man was made in God's likeness, although God's initial idea was to create two entities from which he eventually withdrew. This, in its part, sustained the asymmetry of gender prevalent in the surrounding context. Another potential explanation to the biblical discrepancies observed by the rabbis was that the Septuagint was justifiably translated changing *them* to *him, i.e.,* God created *him* male and female.

Advocating marriage, and marital sex, also continued during the second discursive stage of the rabbinic discourse. It was most often used to rationalize the creation of woman. The need for a wife was realized when the man first had intercourse with animals. Indeed, woman seems to be just an object of man's carnal desire which is an inalienable part of male nature. A command for men to always walk before women on a road is repeated several times, and the woman seems to be responsible for the potential libidinous thoughts by a man possibly walking behind her. Based on the creation account, the rabbis attested that men have sexual dominance over women.

The famous tradition of Adam's twelve hours in paradise was given in connection with the second discursive stage so that instead on concentrating on Adam's sin, as previously had been done, the passage brings up another potential culprit: the woman who was pared to him. Only if the man is fortunate, the woman does not cause harm to her husband. Thus, the rabbis seem to have considered the creation of woman unfortunate, in many ways. However, Eve was needed for propagation and to serve as a handmaid, remarkably differing from previous versions of the same legend. Women are labelled according to their purpose in male reality, and owning a wife is parallelized with possessing land.

The third discursive stage (7^{th}–9^{th} centuries), clearly identifiable in the study, can be characterized as proliferation of Jewish scholarly writings, also expanding the earlier interpretive tradition. There are several augmentations obviously deviating from earlier interpretations on the creation of human. For example, the primal being is created in four colors. As Adam of this discursive stage was – explicitly – created as a single being, hundreds-of-years long collective effort of the rabbis to solve the discrepancy between the two accounts on human creation was nullified.

The rabbis of this phase in the interpretive tradition concocted new explanations for the creation of woman. She had to be created so that no creature would think Adam was the creator of everything. One of the most important purposes of female creation seems to be marriage – it is so important that God finally decided to create Eve, although he knew that Adam would complain about the woman. It is notable that God, in fact, first hesitated to create her to begin with. It seems to be only a matter of luck how the help assigned for the man eventually turns out to be. After all, she ended up far from perfect as she is bad-tempered, among other frailties – she even ages fast compared to men.

The outcome of the rabbinic discussions of this discursive stage is that the primal woman was, after all, made out of Adam's bone and, in addition, flesh taken from his heart. The bone is further specified as the thirteenth rib, consolidating the understanding of *ṣela'* namely as a "rib" and abandoning the previous speculations over its potential meaning as a "side". In fact, one passage draws upon the earlier-pointed connection with the Aramaic word for "side" utilizing it so that Eve was made from Adam's thirteenth rib on his side. However, the proper names of both primal beings are equally dependent on God's complex reasoning.

Not only was the creation account used to justify male dominion, as during earlier discursive stages, but it was also utilized to permit sexual exploitation of women. The woman's position during sex is under the man as she is inferior by nature. A woman is to adorn herself and keep quiet, whereas the man deposits sperm into her and makes demands on her – in fact, women are explicitly subservient to men. As women were created from men, they look at men in a dubious way.

The rabbis proposed that, based on the biblical creation accounts, women have to be ashamed in front of people and cover themselves. Furthermore, they have to take care of menstrual purity, dough offering and lightening the Sabbath candles. Although women are punished mainly for Eve's subsequent transgression, the creation of woman already contained an inauspicious tone. The list of Eve's obligations and curses became much longer and self-evident during the third discursive stage, and earlier traditions were linked with disgust concerning menstruation, a natural part of female life. According to the rabbinic discussions, a woman gets properly buried only if she is righteous.

Although stress might have been put on monogyny, Adam had two wives. Despite women being easily influenced, the first wife of Adam, Lilith, was not. Lilith offers a distinctive solution to the classical exegetic problem caused by the two different accounts on human creation. Furthermore, her story seems to teach women that by demanding equality she seriously misbe-

haved, as a consequence of which she ended up as a demon. The price of her freedom was death of her children on a daily basis.

Although rabbinic literature has been diversely studied – also from a feminist perspective – its diachronic development has seldom been addressed. Moreover, only sporadic accounts on the creation of woman or thematic assessments of some traditions regarding this event have been published. The present study is the first to systematically address the evolution of rabbinic writings in connection with the creation of woman. The three discursive stages identifiable during the 500 rabbinic years included in the study most likely reflect changes in the context in which they were compiled, perhaps even a general tendency towards patriarchal trajectories in religious interpretive traditions. However, further studies are needed to address underlying factors and potential universal features beyond. In addition, taking rabbinic discussions on the "original sin" into account would definitely expand the misogynous dimensions of subsequent studies.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Alphabet of Ben Sira. Sefaria.org, The Aleph Bet of ben Sira.

Becker, H. & Berner, C., *Avot de-Rabbi Natan – Synoptische Edition beider Versionen.* Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck. 2006.

Kittel, R. *et al., Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia. Editio Quinta Emendata.* Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft. 1997.

Leviticus Rabba. Sefaria.org, Vayikra Rabbah.

Pirkei de-Rabbi Eliezer. Sefaria.org, Pirkei DeRabbi Eliezer.

Schechter, S., *Abot de-rabbi natan. Mahadurat shlomo zalman schechter ʿim ẓiyunim la-makbilot beyn ha-nusaḥim u-latosafot shebe-mahadorot schechter.* Vienna: [unknown]. 1887.

Talmud bavli. Im kol ham-mefarsim ka'aser nidpas miq-qedem we'im hosafot hadasot kimvoar baš-ša'ar haš-šeni. Jerusalem: Hosa'at hat-talmud. 195-.

Targum Pseudo-Jonathan. Sefaria.org, Targum Jonathan on Genesis.

Theodor, J., *Bereschit Rabba mit kritischen Apparat und Kommentar, Parascha I-XLVII.* Berlin: [unknown]. 1912.

Translations

Brentlinger, J. & Groden, S. (1970). *The Symposium of Plato.* Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.

Epstein, I. (1935). *The Babylonian Talmud – Seder Neziḳin (V). Translated into English with Notes, Glossary and Indices under the Editorship of Rabbi Dr. I. Epstein.* London: The Soncino Press.

Epstein, I. (1936a). *The Babylonian Talmud – Seder Nashim (IX). Translated into English with Notes, Glossary and Indices under the Editorship of Rabbi Dr. I. Epstein.* London: The Soncino Press.

Epstein, I. (1936b). *The Babylonian Talmud – Seder Nashim (XI). Translated into English with Notes, Glossary and Indices under the Editorship of Rabbi Dr. I. Epstein.* London: The Soncino Press.

Epstein, I. (1936c). *The Babylonian Talmud – Seder Nashim (XV). Translated into English with Notes, Glossary and Indices under the Editorship of Rabbi Dr. I. Epstein.* London: The Soncino Press.

Epstein, I. (1938a). *The Babylonian Talmud – Seder Mo'ed (XVII). Translated into English with Notes, Glossary and Indices under the Editorship of Rabbi Dr. I. Epstein.* London: The Soncino Press.

Epstein, I. (1938b). *The Babylonian Talmud – Seder Mo'ed (XIX). Translated into English with Notes, Glossary and Indices under the Editorship of Rabbi Dr. I. Epstein.* London: The Soncino Press.

Epstein, I. (1938c). *The Babylonian Talmud – Seder Mo'ed (XXIV). Translated into English with Notes, Glossary and Indices under the Editorship of Rabbi Dr. I. Epstein.* London: The Soncino Press.

Epstein, I. (1948). *The Babylonian Talmud – Seder Ṭohoroth (XXV). Translated into English with Notes, Glossary and Indices under the Editorship of Rabbi Dr. I. Epstein.* London: The Soncino Press.

Epstein, I. (1958). *The Babylonian Talmud – Seder Zera'im (XXVII). Translated into English with Notes, Glossary and Indices under the Editorship of Rabbi Dr. I. Epstein.* London: The Soncino Press.

Freedman, I. (1961). *Midrash Rabbah – Genesis (3rd ed.), vol 1*. Hertford: Stephen Austin and Sons.

Friedlander, G. (1916). *Pirkê de Rabbi Eliezer – The Chapters of Rabbi Eliezer the Great According to the Text of the Manuscript Belonging to Abraham Epstein of Vienna.* London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co.

The Jewish Bible. (2008). Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society.

Josephus. (1930). *Jewish Antiquities – vol. I, Book I.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Maher, M. (1992). *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan – Genesis.* Edinburgh: T & T Clark.

Neusner, J. (1985). *Genesis Rabbah – The Judaic Commentary to the Book of Genesis – Parashiyyot One Through Thirty-three on Genesis 1:1 to 8:14.* Atlanta: Scholars Press.

Saldarini, A. (1975). *The Fathers according to Rabbi Nathan (Abot de Rabbi Nathan) version B – A Translation and Commentary.* Leiden: Brill.

Sefaria.org.

Devices

Avinoam, R. *et al., Compendious Hebrew-English Dictionary Comprising a Complete Vocabulary of Biblical, Mishnaic, Medieval and Modern Hebrew.* Tel-Aviv: The Dvir Publishing. 1952.

Buller, B. *et al., SBL Handbook of Style – For Biblical Studies and Related Disciplines*. 2nd edition. Atlanta: SBL Press. 2014.

Jastrow, M., *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature, with an Index of Scriptural Quotations.* New York: Judaica Press. 1996.

Kaddari, M. Z., *Dictionary of Biblical Hebrew (Alef-Taw) – Oṣar Lešon ha-Migra‘ me-Alef ‘ad Taw.* 2nd edition. Ramat-Gan: Hotsaʾat Universiṭat Bar-Ilan. 2007.

Sokoloff, M., *A Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic of the Byzantine Period.* Ramat-Gan: Bar Ilan University Press. 1990.

Sokoloff, M., *A Dictionary of Jewish Babylonian Aramaic of the Talmudic and Geonic Periods.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press. 2002.

Research Literature

Abou-Bakr, O. (2015). The Interpretive Legacy of Qiwamah as Exegetical Construct. Z. Mir-Hosseini *et al.* (eds.), *Men in Charge? Rethinking Authority in Muslim Legal Tradition*. Oxford: OneWorld, 44–64.

Adelman, R. (2009). *The Return of the Repressed – Pirqe de-Rabbi Eliezer and the Pseudepigrapha*. Leiden: Brill.

Alexander, E. (2000). The Impact of Feminism on Rabbinic Studies – The Impossible Paradox of Reading Women into Rabbinic Literature. J. Frankel (ed.), *Jews and Gender – The Challenge to Hierarchy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 101–118.

Amir, Y. & Niehoff, M. (2007). Philo Judaeus. M. Berenbaum & F. Skolnik (eds.), *Encyclopaedia Judaica (2nd ed.), vol. 16.* Detroit: Macmillan Reference, 59–64.

Anaïs, S. (2013). Genealogy and Critical Discourse Analysis in Conversation – Texts, Discourse, Critique. *Critical Discourse Studies 10,* 123–135.

Anderson, G. (1992). The Garden of Eden and Sexuality in Early Judaism. H. Eilberg-Schwartz (ed.), *People of the Body – Jews and Judaism from an Embodied Perspective*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 47–68.

Anderson, G. (2001). *The Genesis of Perfection – Adam and Eve in Jewish and Christian Imagination.* Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.

Andrews, S. (2007). What’s the Matter with Eve? – The Woman and her Sentence in Ancient Judaism. R. Crouse *et al.* (eds.), *Divine Creation in Ancient, Medieval, and Early Modern Thought*. Leiden: Brill, 1–22.

Arnold, B. (ed.). (2003). *New Cambridge Bible commentary.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Aschkenasy, N. (1986). *Eve's Journey – Feminine Images in Hebraic Literary Tradition.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Baker, P. (2008). *Sexed Texts – Language, Gender and Sexuality.* London: Equinox Pub.

Baskin, J. (1985). The Separation of Women in Rabbinic Judaism. E. Findly & Y. Haddad (eds.), *Women, Religion, and Social Change.* Albany: State University of New York Press, 3–18.

Baskin, J. (1995). Rabbinic Judaism and the Creation of Woman. *Shofar – An Interdisciplinary Journal of Jewish Studies 14*, 66–71.

Baskin, J. (2002). *Midrashic Women – Formations of the Feminine in Rabbinic Literature.* Hanover: University Press of New England [for] Brandeis University Press.

Batto, B. (2013). *In the Beginning – Essays on Creation Motifs in the Ancient Near East and the Bible.* Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

Baxter, J. (2003). *Positioning Gender in Discourse – A Feminist Methodology.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Bellis, A. (2002). *Helpmates, Harlots, and Heroes (2nd ed.)*. Louisville: Presbyterian Publishing Corporation.

Ben-Eliyahu, E. (2012). *Handbook of Jewish literature from Late Antiquity – 135–700 CE.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Berman, L. (2007). Plato and Platonism. M. Berenbaum & F. Skolnik (eds.), *Encyclopaedia Judaica (2nd ed.), vol. 16.* Detroit: Macmillan Reference, 226–227.

Biale, R. (1984). *Women and Jewish Law – An Exploration of Women's Issues in Halakhic Sources.* New York: Schocken Books.

Bird, P. (1997). *Missing Persons and Mistaken Identities – Women and Gender in Ancient Israel.* Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Bittles, A. (2012). *Consanguinity in Context.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Blommaert, J. (2005). *Discourse – A Critical Introduction.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Borowitz, E. (2006). *The Talmud's Theological Language-game – A philosophical Discourse Analysis.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Boyarin, D. (1995). *Carnal Israel – Reading Sex in Talmudic Culture.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Brand, J. *et al.* (2007). Gaon. M. Berenbaum & F. Skolnik (eds.), *Encyclopaedia Judaica (2nd ed.), vol. 7.* Detroit: Macmillan Reference, 380–386.

Bronner, L. (1993). From Veil to Wig – Jewish Women's Hair Covering. *Judaism – A Quarterly Journal of Jewish Life and Thought 42,* 465–477.

Bronner, L. (1994). *From Eve to Esther – Rabbinic Reconstructions of Biblical Women.* Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.

Brower, R. (2018). *Enigma of Creation.* – available at lulu.com (visited September 7th 2019).

Burr, V. (2015). *Social Constructionism (3rd ed.).* London: Routledge.

Butler, J. (1993). *Bodies That Matter – On the Discursive Limits of "Sex".* Abingdon: Routledge.

Börner-Klein, D. (2010). Tell Me Who I Am – Reading the Alphabet of Ben Sira. H. Liss & M. Oeming (eds.), *Literary Construction of Identity in the Ancient World*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 136–144.

Carvalho, D. (2009). *Woman Has Two Faces – Re-examining Eve and Lilith in Jewish Feminist Thought.* MA Thesis: University of Denver.

Cassuto, U. (1959). *A Commentary on the Book of Genesis Part 1*. Jerusalem: The Magnes Press.

Cherry, S. (2007). *Torah Through Time – Understanding Bible Commentary from the Rabbinic Period to Modern Times.* Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society.

Clifford, R. (1994). *Creation Accounts in the Ancient Near East and the Bible.* Washington: The Catholic Biblical Association of America.

Clines, D. (1990). *What Does Eve Do to Help? – And Other Readerly Questions to the Old Testament.* Sheffield: JSOT Press.

Cohen, S. (1991). Menstruants and the Sacred in Judaism and Christianity. S. Pomeroy (ed.), *Women's History and Ancient History*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 273–299.

Cook, E. (1987). *Rewriting the Bible – The Text and Language of the Pseudo-Jonathan Targum.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.

Cook, E. (2012). The Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in the Targums. M. Henze (ed.), *A Companion to Biblical Interpretation in Early Judaism*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans. 92–117.

Craig, E. (2005). Plato (427–347 BC). E. Craig (ed.), *The Shorter Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. London: Routledge, 936–956.

Cramer, J. (2009). Critical Discourse Analysis. K. Foss & S. Littlejohn (eds.), *Encyclopedia of Communication Theory*. Los Angeles: Sage, 326–328.

Crawford, S. (2008). *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times.* Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Pub.

Dan, J. (2007). Ben Sira, Alphabet of. M. Berenbaum & F. Skolnik (eds.), *Encyclopaedia Judaica (2nd ed.), vol. 3*. Detroit: Macmillan Reference, 375–376.

Davidman, L. & Tenenbaum, S. (1994). *Feminist Perspectives on Jewish Studies.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

van Dijk, T. (2001). Multidisciplinary CDA – A Plea for Diversity. R. Wodak & M. Meyer (eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage, 95–120.

Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical Discourse Analysis – The Critical Study of Language.* London: Longman.

Fairclough, N. (2001). *Language and Power (2nd ed.).* Harlow: Longman.

Fairclough, N. (2004). *Analysing Discourse – Textual Analysis for Social Research.* London: Taylor & Francis.

Fike, B. (2015). A reinvestigation of "The Creation of Woman" from a Hebraic Viewpoint. *2015 Hawaii University International Conferences.* – available at 2015 Hawaii University International Conferences (visited July 27th 2019).

Fishman, T. (2011). *Becoming the People of the Talmud – Oral Torah as Written Tradition in Medieval Jewish Cultures.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Flesher, P. & Chilton, B. (2011). *The Targums – A Critical Introduction.* Waco: Baylor University Press.

Flood, J. (2010). *Representations of Eve in Antiquity and the English Middle Ages.* New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.

Fonrobert, C. (2000). *Menstrual Purity – Rabbinic and Christian Reconstructions of Biblical Gender.* Stanford: Stanford University Press

Fonrobert, C. (2005). On "Carnal Israel" and the Consequences – Talmudic Studies since Foucault. *The Jewish Quarterly Review 95*, 462–469.

Fonrobert, C. & Jaffee, M. (2007). Introduction – The Talmud, Rabbinic Literature, and Jewish Culture. C. Fonrobert & M. Jaffee (eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Talmud and Rabbinic Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1–14.

Frymer-Kensky, T. (1994). The Bible and Women's Studies. L. Davidman & S. Tenenbaum (eds.), *Feminist Perspectives on Jewish Studies.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 16–40.

Fuchs, E. (2008). Feminist Approaches to the Hebrew Bible. F. Greenspahn (ed.), *The Hebrew Bible –New insights and Scholarship*. New York: New York University Press, 76–95.

Gafni, I. (1984). The Historical Background. M. Stone (ed.), *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period – Apocarypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus*. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1–34.

Gee, J. & Handford, M. (eds.) (2011). *The Routledge Handbook of Discourse Analysis.* New York: Routledge.

Ginzberg, L. *et al.* (2003). *Legends of the Jews (2nd ed.).* Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society.

Goldenberger, R. (1984). Talmud. B. Holtz (ed.), *Back to the Sources – Reading the Classic Jewish Texts*. New York: Simon & Schuster Paperbacks, 129–158.

Gray, A. (2007). Amoraim. M. Berenbaum & F. Skolnik (eds.), *Encyclopaedia Judaica (2nd ed.), vol. 2*. Detroit: Macmillan Reference, 89–95.

Grypeou, E. & Spurling, H. (2013). *The Book of Genesis in Late Antiquity – Encounters between Jewish and Christian Exegesis.* Leiden: Brill.

Gutting, G. (2005). *Foucault – A Very Short Introduction.* Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.

Halkin, A. (2007). Saadiah (ben Joseph) Gaon. M. Berenbaum & F. Skolnik (eds.), *Encyclopaedia Judaica (2nd ed.), vol. 17*. Detroit: Macmillan Reference, 606–614.

Hasan-Rokem, G. (2003). *Tales of the Neighborhood – Jewish Narrative Dialogues in Late Antiquity.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hauptman, J. (1994). Feminist Perspectives on Rabbinic Texts. L. Davidman & S. Tenenbaum (eds.), *Feminist Perspectives on Jewish Studies*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 16–40.

Hauptman, J. (1998). *Rereading the Rabbis – A Woman's Voice.* Boulder: Westview Press.

Hayward, R. (2010). *Targums and the Transmission of Scripture into Judaism and Christianity.* Leiden: Brill.

Heger, P. (2014). *Women in the Bible, Qumran, and Early Rabbinic Literature – Their Status and Roles.* Leiden: Brill.

Heinemann, J. (2007). Leviticus Rabbah. M. Berenbaum & F. Skolnik (eds.), *Encyclopaedia Judaica (2nd ed.), vol. 12*. Detroit: Macmillan Reference, 740–742.

Herr, M. (2007a). Midrash. M. Berenbaum & F. Skolnik (eds.), *Encyclopaedia Judaica (2nd ed.), vol. 14*. Detroit: Macmillan Reference, 182–185.

Herr, M. (2007b). Pirkei de-Rabbi Eliezer. M. Berenbaum & F. Skolnik (eds.), *Encyclopaedia Judaica (2nd ed.), vol. 16*. Detroit: Macmillan Reference, 182–183.

Herr, M. & Wald, S. (2007). Genesis Rabbah. M. Berenbaum & F. Skolnik (eds.), *Encyclopaedia Judaica (2nd ed.), vol. 7*. Detroit: Macmillan Reference, 448–449.

Heschel, S. (1992). Anti-Judaism in Christian Feminist Theology. M. Lerner (ed.), *Tikkun – To Heal, Repair, and Transform the World*. Oakland: Tikkun Books, 275–282.

Hjelm, T. (2011). Discourse Analysis. S. Engler & M. Stausberg (eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Research Methods in the Study of Religion.* Abingdon: Routledge.

van den Hoek, A. (2000). Endowed with Reason or Glued to the Senses – Philo's thoughts on Adam and Eve. G. Luttikhuizen (ed.), *The Creation of Man and Woman – Interpretations of the Biblical Narratives in Jewish and Christian Traditions*. Leiden: Brill, 63–75.

House, D. (2007). The Origin and Nature of Humankind in Plato's Symposium. R. Crouse *et al.* (eds.), *Divine Creation in Ancient, Medieval, and Early Modern Thought – Essays Presented to the Rev'd Dr. Robert D. Crouse*. Leiden: Brill, 45–72.

Ilan, T. (1994a). *Jewish Women in Greco-Roman Palestine – An Inquiry into Image and Status.* Tübingen: Mohr.

Ilan, T. (1994b). Matrona and Rabbi Jose – An Alternative Interpretation. *Journal for the Study of Judaism 25,* 18–51.

Ilan, T. (1997). *Mine and Yours are Hers – Retrieving Women's History from Rabbinic Literature.* Kinderhook: Brill.

Jacobs, L. (1991). *Structure and Form in the Babylonian Talmud.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jørgensen, M. & Phillips, L. (2002). *Discourse Analysis – As Theory and Method.* London: Sage.

Jule, A. (2007). *Language and Religious Identity – Women in Discourse.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kahana, M. (2007). Midreshei Halakhah. M. Berenbaum & F. Skolnik (eds.), *Encyclopaedia Judaica (2nd ed.), vol. 14*. Detroit: Macmillan Reference, 193–204.

Kaufman, S. (2013). Targum Pseudo-Jonathan and Late Jewish Literary Aramaic. *Aramaic Studies 11,* 1–26.

Kiel, Y. (2015). Creation by Emission – Reconstructing Adam and Eve in the Babylonian Talmud in Light of Zoroastrian and Manichaean Literature. *Journal of Jewish Studies 66*, 295–316.

Kiel, Y. (2016). *Sexuality in the Babylonian Talmud – Christian and Sasanian Contexts in Late Antiquity.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Kikawada, I. (1994). The Double Creation of Mankind in Enki and Ninmah, Atrahasis I 1–351, and Genesis 1–2. R. Hess & D. Tsumura (eds.), *I Studied Inscriptions from Before the Flood – Ancient Near Eastern, Literary, and Linguistic Approaches to Genesis 1–11*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 169–174.

Kister, M. (2007). Avot de-Rabbi Nathan. M. Berenbaum & F. Skolnik (eds.), *Encyclopaedia Judaica (2nd ed.), vol. 2*. Detroit: Macmillan Reference, 750–751.

Kister, M. *et al.* (2015). Preface. R. Clements *et al.* (eds.), *Tradition, Transmission, and Transformation from Second Temple Literature through Judaism and Christianity in Late Antiquity*, VII–XII. Leiden: Brill.

Klein, M. *et al.* (2011). *Michael Klein on the Targums – Collected essays 1972–2002.* Leiden: Brill.

Kosior, W. (2018). A Tale of Two Sisters – The Image of Eve in Early Rabbinic Literature and Its Influence on the Portrayal of Lilith in the Alphabet of Ben Sira. *Nashim – A Journal of Jewish Women's Studies & Gender Issues 32*, 112–130.

Kosman, A. (2012). *Gender and Dialogue in the Rabbinic Prism.* Boston: De Gruyter.

Kramer, S. (1959). *History Begins at Sumer – Twenty-seven "Firsts" in Man's Recorded History.* Garden City: Doubleday.

Kroløkke, C. & Sørensen, A. (2006). *Gender Communication Theories & Analyses – From Silence to Performance.* Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Krygier, R. (2007). Woman, Taken Out of Man – An Aggadic Perspective on Gender Equality. *Conservative Judaism 59*, 66–85.

Kugel, J. (1998). *Traditions of the Bible – A Guide to the Bible as It Was at the Start of the Common Era.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Kugel, J. (2012). *A Walk Through Jubilees – Studies in the Book of Jubilees and the World of its Creation.* Leiden & Boston: Brill.

Kvam, K. *et al.* (1999). *Eve and Adam – Jewish, Christian, and Muslim readings on Genesis and gender.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Lachs, S. (1974). The Pandora-Eve Motif in Rabbinic Literature. *The Harvard Theological Review 67*, 341–345.

LaCocque, A. (2006). *The Trial of Innocence – Adam, Eve, and the Yahwist.* Eugene: Cascade Books.

Langer, G. (2016). Leviticus Rabbah – Its Structure and Purpose. C. Cordoni & G. Langer (eds.), *Let the Wise Listen and Add to their Learning (Prov. 1:5) – Festschrift for Günter Stemberger on the Occasion of his 75th Birthday*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 345–380.

Lazar, M. (2005). Politicizing Gender in Discourse – Feminist Critical Discourse Analysis as Political Perspective and Praxis. M. Lazar (ed.), *Feminist Critical Discourse Analysis*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1–30.

Lazar, M. (2007). Feminist Critical Discourse Analysis – Articulating a Feminist Discourse Praxis 1. *Critical Discourse Studies 4*, 141–164.

Lerner, B. (2018). The Ten Curses of Eve. *Women in Judaism 15*, 1–15.

Lesses, R. (2005). Lilith. L. Jones (ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Religion (2nd ed.)*. Detroit: Macmillan Reference USA, 5458–5460.

Litosseliti, L. & Sunderland, J. (2002). *Gender Identity and Discourse Analysis.* Philadelphia: John Benjamins Pub.

Lorberbaum, Y. (2015). *In God's Image – Myth, Theology, and Law in Classical Judaism.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mack, H. (1989). *The Aggadic Midrash Literature.* Tel Aviv: Naidat Press.

McKeown, J. (2008). *Genesis – The Two Horizons Old Testament Commentary.* Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans.

Meyers, C. (1988). *Discovering Eve – Ancient Israelite Women in Context.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Meyers, C. (2012). *Rediscovering Eve – Ancient Israelite Women in Context.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Neusner, J. (1995). Evaluating the Attributions of Sayings to Named Sages in the Rabbinic Literature. *Journal for the Study of Judaism 26*, 93–111.

Neusner, J. (1999). *The Four Stages of Rabbinic Judaism.* New York: Routledge.

Neusner, J. (2002). *How the Talmud Works.* Leiden: Brill.

Neusner, J. (2004a). *Confronting Creation – How Judaism reads Genesis. An Anthology of Genesis Rabbah.* Eugene: Wipf and Stock.

Neusner, J. (2004b). Genesis in Genesis Rabbah. A. Avery-Peck & J. Neusner (eds.), *Encyclopedia of Midrash – Biblical Interpretation in Formative Judaism*. Leiden: Brill, 88–105.

Neusner, J. (2004c). Genesis Rabbah, Theology of. A. Avery-Peck & J. Neusner (eds.), *Encyclopedia of Midrash – Biblical Interpretation in Formative Judaism*. Leiden: Brill, 105–121.

Neusner, J. (2004d). Leviticus in Leviticus Rabbah. A. Avery-Peck & J. Neusner (eds.), *Encyclopedia of Midrash – Biblical Interpretation in Formative Judaism.* Leiden: Brill, 411–428.

Noort, E. (2000). The Creation of Man and Woman in Biblical and Ancient Near Eastern Traditions. G. Luttikhuizen (ed.), *The Creation of Man and Woman – Interpretations of the Biblical Narratives in Jewish and Christian Traditions*. Leiden: Brill, 1–18.

Odeberg, H. (1939). *The Aramaic Portions of Bereshit Rabba with Grammar of Galilæn Aramaic, vol 1.* Lund: Gleerup.

Orpana, J. (2016). *Reception of the Creation of Humanity – Transmission and Interpretation of the Creation Traditions in Late Second Temple Jewish literature.* Helsinki: University of Helsinki.

Otzen, B. *et al.* (1980). *Myths in the Old Testament.* London: SCM Press.

Pardes, I. (1992). *Countertraditions in the Bible – A feminist Approach.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Peskowitz, M. (1997). *Spinning Fantasies – Rabbis, Gender, and History.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Phillips, N. & Hardy, C. (2002). *Discourse Analysis – Investigating Processes of Social Construction.* Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Polzer, N. (2012). Misogyny Revisited – The Eve Traditions in Avot de Rabbi Natan, Versions A and B. *AJS Review 36,* 207–255.

Porton, G. (2004). Midrash, Definitions of. A. Avery-Peck & J. Neusner (eds.), *Encyclopedia of Midrash – Biblical Interpretation in Formative Judaism*. Leiden: Brill, 520–534.

Powell, J. (2013). *Feminism.* New York: Novinka.

Rabinowitz, L. & Wald, G. (2007). Talmud, Jerusalem. M. Berenbaum & F. Skolnik (eds.), *Encyclopaedia Judaica (2nd ed.), vol. 19.* Detroit: Macmillan Reference, 483–487.

von Rad, G. (1985). Genesis – A Commentary. *The Old Testament Library.* London: SCM Press.

Raveh, I. (2014). *Feminist Rereadings of Rabbinic Literature.* Waltham, Massachusetts: Brandeis University Press.

Rothkoff, A. *et al.* (2007). Rashi. M. Berenbaum & F. Skolnik (eds.), *Encyclopaedia Judaica (2nd ed.), vol. 17*. Detroit: Macmillan Reference, 101–106.

Rubenstein, J. (2003). *The Culture of the Babylonian Talmud.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Rubenstein, J. (2005). *Creation and Composition –The Contribution of the Bavli Redactors (Stammaim) to the Aggada*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Rubenstein, J. (2007). Social and Institutional Settings of Rabbinic Literature. C. Fonrobert & M. Jaffee (eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Talmud and Rabbinic Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 58–74.

Saar, M. (2002). Genealogy and Subjectivity. *European Journal of Philosophy 10*, 231–245.

Saar, M. (2008). Understanding Genealogy – History, Power, and the Self. *Journal of the Philosophy of History 2*, 295–314.

Sacks, S. (2009). *Midrash and Multiplicity – Pirke de-Rabbi Eliezer and the Renewal of Rabbinic Interpretive Culture.* Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Samely, A. (1994). Is Targumic Aramaic Rabbinic Hebrew? A Reflection on Midrashic and Targumic Rewording of Scripture. *Journal of Jewish Studies 45*, 92–100.

Sarna, N. (1989). *The JPS Torah commentary – Genesis. The Traditional Hebrew Text with the New JPS Translation.* Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society.

Sarna, N. *et al.* (2007). Bible. M. Berenbaum & F. Skolnik (eds.), *Encyclopaedia Judaica (2nd ed.), vol. 3*. Detroit: Macmillan Reference, 572–679.

Satlow, M. (1996). "Texts of Terror" – Rabbinic Texts, Speech Acts, and the Control of Mores. *AJS Review 21*, 273–298.

Satlow, M. L. (2006). *Creating Judaism – History, Tradition, Practice.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Sauntson, H. (2011). *Approaches to Gender and Spoken Classroom Discourse.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Schalit, A. (2007). Josephus Flavius. M. Berenbaum & F. Skolnik (eds.), *Encyclopaedia Judaica (2nd ed.), vol. 11*. Detroit: Macmillan Reference, 435–442.

Schiffman, L. (2003). *Understanding Second Temple and Rabbinic Judaism.* Jersey City: Ktav Pub. House.

Schofer, J. W. (2005). *The Making of a Sage – A Study in Rabbinic Ethics.* Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Scholem, G. (2007). Lilith. M. Berenbaum & F. Skolnik (eds.), *Encyclopaedia Judaica (2nd ed.), vol. 13*. Detroit: Macmillan Reference, 17–20.

Scholz, S. (2013). Introduction – The Past, the Present, and the Future of Feminist Hebrew Bible Interpretation. S. Scholz (ed.), *Feminist Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Retrospect, vol. 1*. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 1–10.

Schremer, A. (1997). How Much Jewish Polygyny in Roman Palestine? *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research 63*, 181–223.

Schwartz, B. (2012). *Judaism's Great Debates – Timeless Controversies from Abraham to Herzl.* Lincoln: JPS.

von Schöneman, K. (2018). *"Confine Your Women!" – Diachronic Development of Medieval Sunnī Exegeses on the Creation of Woman.* MA Thesis. University of Helsinki. – available at eThesis Library of University of Helsinki.

Secunda, S. (2012). The Construction, Composition and Idealization of the Female Body in Rabbinic Literature and Parallel Iranian Texts – Three Excursuses. *Nashim: a Journal of Jewish Women's Studies & Gender Issues 23*, 60–86.

Segal, E. (2005). *From Sermon to Commentary – Expounding the Bible in Talmudic Babylonia.* Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.

Shachter, I. & Freedman, H. (1935). Introduction. I. Epstein (ed.), *The Babylonian Talmud – Seder Neziḳin (V). Translated into English with Notes, Glossary and Indices under the Editorship of Rabbi Dr. I. Epstein.* London: The Soncino Press, xi–xvi.

Shin'an, A. (1991). Targumic Additions in Targum Pseudo-Jonathan. *Textus 16*, 139–155.

Simkins, R. (1998) Gender Construction in the Yahwist Creation Myth. A. Brenner (ed.), *Genesis – A Feminist Companion to the Bible.* Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 32–52.

Simon, M. (1938). Introduction. I. Epstein (ed.), *The Babylonian Talmud – Seder Mo'ed (XXIV). Translated into English with Notes, Glossary and Indices under the Editorship of Rabbi Dr. I. Epstein*. London: The Soncino Press, xi–xii.

Simon, M. (1958). Introduction to Berakoth. I. Epstein (ed.), *The Babylonian Talmud – Seder Zera'im (XXVII). Translated into English with Notes, Glossary and Indices under the Editorship of Rabbi Dr. I. Epstein*. London: The Soncino Press, xxvii–xxviii.

Smelik, W. (2018). A Single, Huge, Aramaic Spoken Heretic – Sequences of Adam's Creation in Early Rabbinic Literature. G. Allen and J. Dunne (eds.), *Ancient Readers and Their Scriptures – Engaging the Hebrew Bible in Early Judaism and Christianity.* Leiden: Brill, 175–208.

Slotki, I. (1936). Introduction. I. Epstein (ed.), *The Babylonian Talmud – Seder Nashim (XI). Translated into English with Notes, Glossary and Indices under the Editorship of Rabbi Dr. I. Epstein*. London: The Soncino Press, xi–xvii.

Slotki, I. (1938). Introduction. I. Epstein (ed.), *The Babylonian Talmud – Seder Mo'ed (XIX). Translated into English with Notes, Glossary and Indices under the Editorship of Rabbi Dr. I. Epstein*. London: The Soncino Press, xi–xv.

Slotki, I. (1948). Introduction. I. Epstein (ed.), *The Babylonian Talmud – Seder Ṭohoroth (XXV). Translated into English with Notes, Glossary and Indices under the Editorship of Rabbi Dr. I. Epstein.* London: The Soncino Press, xxvii –xxviii.

Speiser, E. (1964). Genesis – Introduction, Translation, and Notes. *The Anchor Bible.* Garden City: Doubleday.

Sperber, D. (2007a). Savora, Savoraim. M. Berenbaum & F. Skolnik (eds.), *Encyclopaedia Judaica (2nd ed.), vol. 18*. Detroit: Macmillan Reference, 85.

Sperber, D. (2007b). Tanna, Tannaim. M. Berenbaum & F. Skolnik (eds.), *Encyclopaedia Judaica (2nd ed.), vol. 19*. Detroit: Macmillan Reference, 505–507.

Stemberger, G. (1996). *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash (2nd ed.).* Glasgow: Bell & Bain.

Stemberger, G. (2017). The Glory of Adam – Some Aspects of the Potrayal of Adam in Rabbinical Writings. A. Laato & L. Valve (eds.), *Adam and Eve Story in Jewish, Christian and Islamic Perspectives*. Åbo: Åbo Akademi University, 217–234.

Stern, D. (2004). The Alphabet of Ben Sira and the Early History of Parody in Jewish Literature. J. Kugel *et al.* (eds.), *The Idea of Biblical Interpretation – Essays in Honor of James L. Kugel*. Leiden: Brill, 423–448.

von Stuckrad, K. (2013). Discursive Study of Religion – Approaches, Definitions, Implications. *Method & Theory in the Study of Religion 25*, 5–25.

Sunderland, J. (2004). *Gendered Discourses.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Ta-Shma, I. *et al.* (2007). Responsa. M. Berenbaum & F. Skolnik (eds.), *Encyclopaedia Judaica (2nd ed.), vol. 17*. Detroit: Macmillan Reference, 228–239.

Teugels, L. (2000). The Creation of the Human in Rabbinic Interpretation. G. Luttikhuizen (ed.), *The Creation of Man and Woman – Interpretations of the Biblical Narratives in Jewish and Christian Traditions*. Leiden: Brill, 107–127.

Toepel, A. (2012). Adamic Traditions in Early Christian and Rabbinic Literature. A. Orlow & G. Boccaccini (eds.), *New Perspectives on 2 Enoch – No Longer Slavonic Onl*y. Leiden: Brill, 305–324.

Townsend, J. (1994). Creation and Gender in Rabbinic Literature. *Encounter (Indianapolis) 55*, 1–21.

Trible, P. (1983). *God and the Rhetoric of Sexuality.* Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

Tropper, A. (2007). Avot. M. Berenbaum & F. Skolnik (eds.), *Encyclopaedia Judaica (2nd ed.), vol. 2*. Detroit: Macmillan Reference, 746–750.

Tuori, R. (2019). Sukupuoli rabbiinisessa kirjallisuudessa. S. Asikainen & E. Uusimäki (eds.), *Sukupuoli Raamatun maailmassa.* Helsinki: Suomen eksegeettinen seura, 237–253.

Urbach, E. (1975). *The Sages – Their Concepts and Beliefs.* Jerusalem: Magnes Press, Hebrew University.

Visotzky, B. (2003). *Golden Bells and Pomegranates – Studies in Midrash Leviticus Rabbah.* Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Wald, S. (2007a). Mishnah. M. Berenbaum & F. Skolnik (eds.), *Encyclopaedia Judaica (2nd ed.), vol. 14*. Detroit: Macmillan Reference, 319–331.

Wald, S. (2007b). Talmud, Babylonian. M. Berenbaum & F. Skolnik (eds.), *Encyclopaedia Judaica (2nd ed.), vol. 19*. Detroit: Macmillan Reference, 470–481.

Wald, S. (2007c). Tosefta. M. Berenbaum & F. Skolnik (eds.), *Encyclopaedia Judaica (2nd ed.), vol. 20*. Detroit: Macmillan Reference, 70–72.

Walton, J. (2006). *Ancient Near Eastern Thought and the Old Testament – Introducing the Conceptual World of the Hebrew Bible.* Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.

Warhol, T. (2007). Gender Constructions and Biblical Exegesis – Lessons from a Divinity School Seminar. A. Jule (ed.), *Language and Religious Identity – Women in Discourse*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 50–72.

Wegner, J. (1988). *Chattel or Person? – The Status of Women in the Mishnah.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Wegner, J. (1991). The Image and Status of Women in Classical Rabbinic Judaism. J. Baskin (ed.), *Jewish Women in Historical Perspective*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 94–114.

Wenham, G. (1987). Genesis 1–15. *Word Biblical Commentary.* Waco: Word Books.

Westermann, C. (1990). *Genesis 1–11 – A Commentary.* Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House.

Williams, J. (2014). *Understanding Poststructuralism.* Abingdon: Routledge.

Wimpfheimer, B. (2011). The Dialogical Talmud – Daniel Boyarin and Rabbinics. *Jewish Quarterly Review 101*, 245–254.

Wodak, R. (1997). *Gender and Discourse.* London: Sage.

Wodak, R. (2015). Gender and Language – Cultural Concerns. J. Wright (ed.), *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences (2nd ed.*). Elsevier, 698–703.

Wodak, R. & Meyer, M. (2001). *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis.* London: Sage.

Woolstenhulme, K. (2017). The Role and Status of the Biblical Matriarchs in Genesis Rabbah. PhD Dissertation. Durham University.

Yee, G. (2018). *The Hebrew Bible – Feminist and Intersectional Perspectives.* Baltimore: Fortress Press.

Zevit, Z. (2013). *What Really Happened in the Garden of Eden?* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Appendix I – Creation of Human in Hebrew Bible

בְּרֵאשִׁית*	**Genesis
וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים נַעֲשֶׂה אָדָם בְּצַלְמֵנוּ כִּדְמוּתֵנוּ וְיִרְדּוּ בִדְגַת הַיָּם וּבְעוֹף הַשָּׁמַיִם וּבַבְּהֵמָה הָאָרֶץ-הָרֶמֶשׂ הָרֹמֵשׂ עַל-הָאָרֶץ וּבְכָל-וּבְכָל	1:26 And God said, "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness. They shall rule the fish of the sea, the birds of the sky, the cattle, the whole earth, and all the creeping things that creep on earth."
הָאָדָם בְּצַלְמוֹ בְּצֶלֶם -וַיִּבְרָא אֱלֹהִים אֶת אֱלֹהִים בָּרָא אֹתוֹ זָכָר וּנְקֵבָה בָּרָא אֹתָם	27 And God created man in His image, in the image of God He created him; male and female He created them.
וַיְבָרֶךְ אֹתָם אֱלֹהִים וַיֹּאמֶר לָהֶם אֱלֹהִים פְּרוּ הָאָרֶץ וְכִבְשֻׁהָ וּרְדוּ בִּדְגַת -וּרְבוּ וּמִלְאוּ אֶת -חַיָּה הָרֹמֶשֶׂת עַל-הַיָּם וּבְעוֹף הַשָּׁמַיִם וּבְכָל הָאָרֶץ	28 God blessed them and God said to them, "Be fertile and increase, fill the earth and master it; and rule the fish of the sea, the birds of the sky, and all the living things that creep on earth."
וַיִּיצֶר יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים אֶת־הָאָדָם עָפָר מִן־ הָאֲדָמָה וַיִּפַּח בְּאַפָּיו נִשְׁמַת חַיִּים וַיְהִי הָאָדָם לְנֶפֶשׁ חַיָּה	2:7 The LORD God formed man from the dust of the earth. He blew into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living being.
וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים לֹא־טוֹב הֱיוֹת הָאָדָם לְבַדּוֹ אֶעֱשֶׂה־לּוֹ עֵזֶר כְּנֶגְדּוֹ	2:18 The LORD God said, "It is not good for man to be alone; I will make a fitting helper for him."
וַיִּצֶר יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים מִן־הָאֲדָמָה כָּל־חַיַּת הַשָּׂדֶה וְאֵת כָּל־עוֹף הַשָּׁמַיִם וַיָּבֵא אֶל־הָאָדָם לִרְאוֹת מַה־יִּקְרָא־לוֹ וְכֹל אֲשֶׁר יִקְרָא־לוֹ הָאָדָם נֶפֶשׁ חַיָּה הוּא שְׁמוֹ	19 And the LORD God formed out of the earth all the wild beasts and all the birds of the sky, and brought them to the man to see what he would call them; and whatever the man called each living creature, that would be its name.
וַיִּקְרָא הָאָדָם שֵׁמוֹת לְכָל־הַבְּהֵמָה וּלְעוֹף הַשָּׁמַיִם וּלְכֹל חַיַּת הַשָּׂדֶה וּלְאָדָם לֹא־מָצָא עֵזֶר כְּנֶגְדּוֹ	20 And the man gave names to all the cattle and to the birds of the sky and to all the wild beasts; but for Adam no fitting helper was found.
וַיַּפֵּל יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים תַּרְדֵּמָה עַל־הָאָדָם וַיִּישָׁן וַיִּקַּח אַחַת מִצַּלְעֹתָיו וַיִּסְגֹּר בָּשָׂר תַּחְתֶּנָּה	21 So the LORD God cast a deep sleep upon the man; and, while he slept, He took one of his ribs and closed up the flesh at that spot.
וַיִּבֶן יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים אֶת־הַצֵּלָע אֲשֶׁר־לָקַח מִן־ הָאָדָם לְאִשָּׁה וַיְבִאֶהָ אֶל־הָאָדָם	22 And the LORD God fashioned the rib that He had taken from the man into a woman; and He brought her to the man.
וַיֹּאמֶר הָאָדָם זֹאת הַפַּעַם עֶצֶם מֵעֲצָמַי וּבָשָׂר מִבְּשָׂרִי לְזֹאת יִקָּרֵא אִשָּׁה כִּי מֵאִישׁ לֻקֳחָה־ זֹּאת	23 Then the man said, "This one at last Is bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh. This one shall be called Woman, for from man was she taken."
עַל־כֵּן יַעֲזָב־אִישׁ אֶת־אָבִיו וְאֶת־אִמּוֹ וְדָבַק בְּאִשְׁתּוֹ וְהָיוּ לְבָשָׂר אֶחָד	24 Hence a man leaves his father and mother and clings to his wife, so that they become one flesh.

* *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (5th edition)

** *New Jewish Publication Society*

Appendix II – List of Rabbis

Name	*Exact Transcription	Description
Abbahu	Abbāhû	3rd–4th-century Palestinian *āmôrāʾ*
Aḥa	Ăḥāʾ	4th-century Palestinian *āmôrāʾ*
Aibu	Aybû	4th-century Palestinian *āmôrāʾ*
Akiva	-	1st-century *tannāʾ*
Ammi (b. Nathan)	Ămî	3rd-century Palestinian *āmôrāʾ*
Aši	-	4th-century Palestinian *āmôrāʾ*
Benaya	Bənāyâ	possibly 2nd-century *tannāʾ*
Dostai	Dôstaʾî	2nd-century *tannāʾ*
Eleazar (b. Šammua)	Elʿāzār / Leʿāzār	2nd-century *tannāʾ*
Eleazar b. Simeon	Elʿāzār bar Šimʿôn	2nd-century *tannāʾ*
Eliezer b. Hurcanus	Ĕlîʿezer bēn Hûrqanûs	1st-century *tannāʾ*
Ḥama b. Ḥanina	Ḥāmāʾ bar Ḥănînāʾ	3rd-century Palestinian *āmôrāʾ*
Ḥanilai	Ḥanîlaʾi	3rd-century Palestinian *āmôrāʾ*
Ḥanina b. Adda	Ḥănînāʾ bar Îdê	3rd-century Babylonian *āmôrāʾ*
Hillel	-	BCE
Ḥisda	Ḥisdāʾ	3rd–4th-century Palestinian *āmôrāʾ*
Hošayya Rabba	Hôšaʿyâ	3rd-century Palestinian *āmôrāʾ*
Huna	Hûnāʾ	3rd-century Babylonian *āmôrāʾ*
Levi	Lēwî	3rd-century Palestinian *āmôrāʾ*
Naḥman b. Ḥisda	Naḥmān bar rav Ḥisdāʾ	4th-century Babylonian *āmôrāʾ*
Naḥman b. Isaac	Naḥmān bar/bēn Yiṣḥāq	4th-century Babylonian *āmôrāʾ*
Nathan	Nātān	2nd-century *tannāʾ*
Ravina I	-	4th-century Palestinian *āmôrāʾ*
Reš Lakiš	*(see Simeon b. Lakiš)*	
Samuel (of Nehardea)	Šəmûʾēl	2nd–3rd-century Palestinian *āmôrāʾ*
Samuel b. Naḥmani	Šəmûʾēl bar Naḥmanî	3rd-century Palestinian *āmôrāʾ*

Samuel b. Isaac	Šəmûʾēl bar/bēn rabbî Yiṣḥāq	3rd–4th-century Palestinian *āmôrāʾ*
Šammai	-	1st-century *tannāʾ*
Simeon b. Eleazar	Šimʿôn bēn Elʿāzār	2nd-century *tannāʾ*
Simeon b. Lakiš	Šimʿôn bēn Lāqîš	3rd-century Palestinian *āmôrāʾ*
Simeon b. Menasya	Šimʿôn bēn Mənāsyāʾ	2nd–3rd-century *tannāʾ*
Simeon b. Pazzi	Šimʿôn bēn Pazzî	3rd-century Palestinian *āmôrāʾ*
Simeon b. Yoḥai	Šimʿôn bēn Yôḥāʾî	2nd-century *tannāʾ*
Simlai	Śimlāʾî	3rd-century Babylonian *āmôrāʾ*
Tanḥum (b. Ḥanilai)	Tanḥûm	3rd-century Palestinian *āmôrāʾ*
Tanḥuma (b. Abba)	Tanḥûmāʾ	4th-century Palestinian *āmôrāʾ*
Yehošua (b. Ḥanania)	Yəhôšūaʿ	1st–2nd-century *tannāʾ*
Yehošua b. Korḥa	Yəhôšuaʿ bēn Korḥāʾ	2nd-century *tannāʾ*
Yehošua of Sikhnin	Yəhôšūaʿ of Siḵnîn	4th-century Palestinian *āmôrāʾ*
Yehuda b. Bathyra	Yəhûdâ bēn Batîrāʾ	1st-century *tannāʾ*
Yehuda (b. Ilai)	Yəhûdâ	2nd-century *tannāʾ*
Yehuda ha-Nasi	-	2nd-century *tannāʾ*
Yehuda b. Rabbi	Yəhûdâ bar Rabbî	probably 3rd-century Palestinian *āmôrāʾ*
Yehuda b. Simon	Yəhûdâ bar Sîmôn	4th-century Palestinian *āmôrāʾ*
Yirmeya	Yirməyâ	4th-century Palestinian *āmôrāʾ*
Yirmeya(hu) b. Eleazar	Yirməyā(hû) bēn Leʿāzār	2nd-century *tannāʾ*
Yoḥanan (b. Nafḥa)	Yôḥānān	3rd-century Palestinian *āmôrāʾ*
Yoḥanan b. Baroka	Yôḥānān bēn Bərôqâ	2nd-century *tannāʾ*
Yoḥanan b. Ḥanina	Yôḥānān bar Ḥănînāʾ	3rd-century Palestinian *āmôrāʾ*
Yoḥanan b. Zakkai	-	1st-century *tannāʾ*
Yose (b. Ḥalafta)	Yôsê	2nd-century *tannāʾ*
Yose b. Kezarta	Yôsê bēn Qəṣartâ	possibly Yose the son of a laundress
Yose b. Zimra	Yôsê bēn Zimrāʾ	2nd–3rd-century *tannāʾ*
Zevid	Zəvîd	4th-century Babylonian *āmôrāʾ*

*exact transcription is given only for sages mentioned in the rabbinic texts analyzed in the study

Appendix III – Glossary of Terminology and Texts

aggādâ – pl. *aggādôt* – nonlegalistic rabbinic traditions containing stories, legends, and interpretations, and providing general guidance for the Jewish community; opposite to *hălāḵâ*.
→ "aggadic"

Ālefbêt də-Bēn Sîrāʾ – Alphabet of Ben Sira. Satirical work representing the geonic period of Jewish interpretive tradition, written by an unknown author in the Eastern areas of the Jewish settlement between the 8th and the 10th century.

āmôrāʾ – pl. *āmôrāʾîm* – lit. "explainer". Eight generations of sages during 200–500 CE in both Byzantine Palestine and Sassanian Babylonia, remarkably contributing to the rabbinic texts, specifically the Talmuds.
→ "amoraic"

Āvôt də-Rabbî Nātān – Avot de-Rabbi Nathan, *i.e.*, "Fathers According to Rabbi Nathan". Palestinian commentary to the mišnaic tractate *Āvôt*, written mainly in Hebrew. The final redaction took place between the 6th and the 8th century representing the geonic period of Jewish interpretive tradition.

bārāytāʾ – pl. *bārāytôt* – tannaitic and mainly halakhic traditions not included in the Mišna; external rabbinic traditions.

Bāvlî – see *Talmûd Bāvlî*.

Bərēʾšît Rabbāʾ – Genesis Rabba, *i.e.*, "Great Genesis". Rabbinic anthology providing a verse-by-verse exegesis to Genesis, composed by Palestinian *āmôrāʾîm* utilizing earlier *aggādôt* from both written and oral sources, and dating to the beginning of the 5th century.

gāʾôn – pl. *gəʾônîm* – lit. "genius, gifted person". Eminent religious scholar and judicial authority serving as the head of a religious academy which first occurred in Babylonia, but later spread wider in the Jewish world during 700–1100 CE.
→ "geonic"

gəmārāʾ – lit. "studying". Discursive part of the Babylonian Talmud containing traditions and exegetic material from various rabbinic sources.

hălāḵâ – pl. *hălāḵôt* – legalistic rabbinic traditions, collected particularly into the Mišna; opposite to *aggādâ*.
→ "halakhic"

masēḵâ – pl. *masēḵôt* – "tractate", part of an "order", *sēder*, in the Mišna and the Talmuds.

məgillâ – pl. *məgillôt* – in plural understood as "Five Scrolls", referring to five specific parts of the Hebrew Bible: Song of Songs, Book of Ruth, Book of Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, and Book of Esther.

midrāš – pl. *midrāšîm* – individual exegetic pericopae, rabbinic method of biblical interpretation, or a compilation of exegetical statements. *Midrəšêy aggādâ* refers to nonlegalistic interpretations (see *aggādâ*), whereas *midrəšêy hălāḵâ* to legalistic ones (see *hălāḵâ*). *Midrāš rabbāʾ* is a collective noun used for the compilations interpreting the Tora in Late Antiquity.
→ "midrašic"

mišnâ – pl. *mišnāyôt* – mišnaic passage; see also *Mišnâ.*

Mišnâ – Mišna. The first extant rabbinic composition, emerging at the end of the 2nd century perhaps on the basis of an initiative by rabbi Yehuda ha-Nasi, the patriarch of Judea. The content focuses on apodictic Jewish law formed in the course of history, *i.e.*, how to apply the written laws in changing times.
→ "mišnaic"

miṣwâ – pl. *miṣwôt* – "commandment".

pārāšâ – pl. *pārāšiyyôt* – "section, chapter" of which the former is used in connection with Genesis Rabba and Leviticus Rabba in the present study.

pereq – pl. *pərāqîm* – "chapter, episode".

pətîḥâ – pl. *pətîḥôt* – "opening" of a passage in rabbinic literature.

Pirqêy də-Rabbî Ĕlîʿezer – Pirkei de-Rabbi Eliezer, *i.e.*, "Chapters of Rabbi Eliezer". Popular midrašic work, reflecting early geonic interpretation and retelling the primeval history from the

beginning until Israel's peregrination in the desert. It was composed in Palestine during the first half of the 8th century.

sāvôrāʾ – pl. *sāvôrāʾîm* – deriving from "to reflect, examine, deduce". Redactor of the Babylonian Talmud.

sēder – pl. *sədārîm* – "order". Subunit of the Mišna and the Talmuds, all comprising six orders.

ṣelaʿ – pl. *ṣəlāʿôt* – "side, rib" (Hebrew).

stammāʾ – pl. *stammāʾîm* – "ananymous". Referring to unnamed redactors of the Babylonian Talmud.

sûgyâ – pl. *sûgyôt* – deriving from "to go, course". Dialectical chains of arguments in Talmuds.

Talmûd – Talmud, lit. "instruction, learning". Mainly refers to the Babylonian Talmud (see *Talmûd Bāvlî*).
→ "talmudic"

Talmûd Bāvlî – Bavli, *i.e.*, "Babylonian Talmud". Monumental Babylonian collection of rabbinic traditions, generally understood as a commentary to the Mišna. The process of its redaction most likely extended to the 6th century. The compilation serves as the primary source of Jewish religious law and Jewish theology.

Talmûd Yerûšalmî – Yerušalmi, *i.e.*, "Palestinian Talmud". Palestinian collection of rabbinic traditions, generally understood as a commentary to the Mišna. It was compiled during the later half of the 4th century.

Tānāḵ – Hebrew Bible. An acronym based on the tripartite nature of the Hebrew Bible, comprising *Tôrâ* (Instructions), *Nəvîʾîm* (Prophets), and *Kətûvîn* (Hagiographa).

tannāʾ – pl. *tannāʾîm* – lit. "reciter" (of traditions). Five generations of sages during 20–200 CE, working in their formally organized schools and academies and facilitating the beginning of rabbinic movement and the literary collection of the traditions.
→ "tannaitic"

targûm – pl. *targûmîm* – lit. "translation". Mainly refers to hermeneutic Aramaic translations of the Pentateuch or the entire Hebrew Bible.
→ "targumic"

Targûm Yerûšalmî – "Targum Pseudo-Jonathan (to the Pentateuch)". Aramaic translation of the Pentateuch composed in late Jewish literary Aramaic not earlier than the 7th century. It contains both literal translation and numerous additions. The name typically used for the composition, Targum Pseudo-Jonathan, refers to medieval error in interpreting the abbreviation *yôd* and the subsequent the false attribution of the work to Jonathan instead of Jerusalem.

Tôrâ – Tora, lit. "instructions". Often refers to the Pentateuch comprising the first five books of the Hebrew Bible, *i.e.*, Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numeri, and Deuteronomy. The word is also used in a more general sense to describe the Jewish law and way of life instructed by God. The Tora has long been understood as bipartite: the written one, *Tôrâ še-biḵtāv*, and the oral one, *Tôrâ še-bəʿal pê*, the latter being an ever-growing corpus of religious knowledge.

Tôseftāʾ – Tosefta, "addition, supplement". The singular form usually refers to the collection of extra-mišnaic traditions.

Way-yiqrāʾ Rabbāʾ – Leviticus Rabba, *i.e.*, "Great Leviticus". Rabbinic homiletical commentary to Leviticus, composed by Palestinian *āmôrāʾîm* and dating to the later half of the 5th century.

Yerûšalmî – see *Talmûd Yerûšalmî.*

yəšîvâ – pl. *yəšîvôt* – a school in which rabbinic literature, specifically the Talmud, is studied by devoted male students.

~

ברוך אתה ה' אלהינו מלך העולם

אשר קדשנו במצותיו וצונו לעסוק בדברי תורה

~